

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

PLEASE RETURN TO USDA
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY
LAW BRANCH, LEGISLATIVE REPORTING
Rm. 117-E, Admin Bldg.
Wash. D. C. Ext. 4654

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 5554, H.R. 5568, H.R. 6056, H.R. 6530,
H.R. 6532, H.R. 6641, H.R. 7077, H.R. 7612,
and H.R. 7961

FEBRUARY 18 AND MARCH 11, 1969

Serial A

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1969

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Chairman*

JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina,
Vice Chairman

THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi
WATKINS M. ABBITT, Virginia
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky
GRAHAM PURCELL, Texas
MASTON O'NEAL, Georgia
THOMAS S. FOLEY, Washington
ELIGIO DE LA GARZA, Texas
JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, Pennsylvania
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
G. V. MONTGOMERY, Mississippi
B. F. SISK, California
BILL ALEXANDER, Arkansas
BILL D. BURLISON, Missouri
ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN, New York
JOHN R. RARICK, Louisiana

PAGE BELCHER, Oklahoma,
Ranking Minority Member

CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California
MRS. CATHERINE MAY, Washington
WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, Virginia
GEORGE A. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
CLARENCE E. MILLER, Ohio
ROBERT B. MATHIAS, California
WILEY MAYNE, Iowa
JOHN M. ZWACH, Minnesota
THOMAS S. KLEPPE, North Dakota
ROBERT D. PRICE, Texas
JOHN T. MYERS, Indiana
KEITH SEBELIUS, Kansas
MARTIN B. McKNEALLY, New York
WILMER D. MIZELL, North Carolina

JORGE L. CORDOVA, Puerto Rico, *Resident Commissioner*

Mrs. CHRISTINE S. GALLAGHER, *Clerk*
WILLIAM C. BLACK, *General Counsel*
L. T. EASLEY, *Staff Consultant*

(II)

CONTENTS

	Page
H.R. 5554, a bill to provide a special milk program for children.....	1
Statement of:	
Christianson, Edwin, vice president, National Farmers Union, presented by Reuben L. Johnson, director of legislative services.....	14
Graham, Harry L., legislative representative, National Farmers Organization.....	38
Greiner, Fred J., director of public affairs, Milk Industry Foundation..	34
Johnson, Reuben L., director, legislative services, National Farmers Union, for Edwin Christianson, vice president.....	14
Kastenmeier, Hon. Robert W., a Representative in Congress from the State of Wisconsin.....	31
Kirchner, Walter C., treasurer, Pure Milk Association.....	13
Lake, Glenn, president, National Milk Producers Federation.....	4
Lyng, Richard E., Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.....	23
Miller, Dr. A. H., Pure Milk Products Cooperative.....	17
Quie, Hon. Albert H., a Representative in Congress from the State of Minnesota.....	2
Scott, John W., master, the National Grange.....	32
Sebelius, Hon. Keith G., a Representative in Congress from the State of Kansas.....	3
Stafford, Hon. Robert T., a Representative in Congress from the State of Vermont.....	30
Steiger, Hon. William A., a Representative in Congress from the State of Wisconsin.....	18
Stratton, Hon. Samuel S., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.....	30
Thomson, Hon. Vernon W., a Representative in Congress from the State of Wisconsin.....	21
Won Pat, Hon. Antonio B., Guam's Representative in Washington, D.C.....	32
York, John C., general manager, Eastern Milk Producers Cooperative Association, Inc.....	35

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1969

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 a.m., in room 1301, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, McMillan, Abernethy, Purcell, Foley, de la Garza, Montgomery, Sisk, Alexander, Burlison, Lowenstein, Rarick, Belcher, Teague of California, May, Wampler, Goodling, Miller, Mathias, Mayne, Zwach, Kleppe, Sebelius, McKneally, and Mizell.

Also present: Christine S. Gallagher, clerk; William C. Black, general counsel, L. T. Easley, staff consultant, and Fowler C. West, assistant staff consultant.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

We meet this morning to consider a number of identical or similar bills to make permanent the special school milk program.

(H.R. 5554, introduced by Mr. Poage, the text of which follows, is similar to H.R. 5568 by Mr. Sisk, H.R. 6056 by Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin, H.R. 6530 by Mr. Podell, H.R. 6532 by Mr. Quie, H.R. 6641 by Mr. Sebelius, H.R. 7077 by Mr. Vigorito, H.R. 7612 by Mr. Reid of New York, and H.R. 7961 by Messrs. Barrett, Nix, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Eilberg, and Green of Pennsylvania.)

[H.R. 5554, 91st Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To provide a special milk program for children

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for each succeeding fiscal year, not to exceed \$125,000,000, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules and regulations as he may deem in the public interest, to encourage consumption of fluid milk by children in the United States in (1) nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, and (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. For the purposes of this section 'United States' means the fifty States and the District of Columbia. The Secretary shall administer the special milk program provided for by this section to the maximum extent practicable in the same manner as he administered the special milk program provided for by Public Law 89-642, as amended, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969."

The CHAIRMAN. I believe the first witness on the list as prepared, is our long-time colleague and associate, Mr. Quie. All of us recognize that he probably knows more about the milk situation than most of us.

We shall be delighted to hear from you, Mr. Quie.

STATEMENT OF HON. ALBERT H. QUIE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. QUIE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I suspect he will have a few amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. He may have.

Mr. QUIE. It is good to be back here, Mr. Chairman, with this committee again. I still have a nostalgic feeling, and I am impressed with the good work you men do.

I want to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for the concern you have shown for the nutritional needs of our young people by scheduling hearings so promptly on legislation to extend the special milk program.

Under this program, fluid wholesome milk is provided to children who would not otherwise receive it. This program is operated in public elementary and secondary schools, nonprofit schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. It reaches into the lives of children who would be deprived of this health-giving food.

The current hearings before the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs are startling the Nation with disclosures of malnutrition unexpected in this era of domestic food surpluses. No present program provides more nutrition more economically than the special milk program. This program must be continued and expanded, I believe.

The bill I have introduced, H.R. 6532, would expand the authorization for the coming fiscal year, which ends on June 30, 1970, to \$125,000,000. The program would be enlarged to \$130,000,000 in fiscal year 1971, and to \$135,000,000 in fiscal year 1972 and thereafter. My bill would authorize the program indefinitely, as yours does, Mr. Chairman, with no cutoff date, at that level of funding.

For the past few years, the funding level has actually been \$104,000,000 annually. In terms of milk, this has provided about 3 billion half pints to approximately 26 million children. With funding kept constant, the program is not meeting the needs of our school-age population. The school-age population has been increasing, but the milk program has not. Therefore, the use of milk is decreasing per capita. I am sure it is the group which can least afford, nutritionally, to drink less milk which is losing out.

Mr. Chairman, the milk producers of the Nation can very easily meet all domestic demands for fresh, wholesome, tasty milk. The special milk program absorbs about 21½ percent of domestic consumption. I urge approval of my bill to expand the program to meet the nutritional deficiencies of our malnourished disadvantaged children and to assure the availability of wholesome milk to supplement the diets of all of our children.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Quie.

We are glad to have your presentation of this matter.

Are there any questions?

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kleppe.

Mr. KLEPPE. Congressman Quie, do you have any suggestions regarding the administration of the program as such?

As far as you are concerned, is it being handled all right administratively?

Mr. QUIE. I think it is being handled well. I know some school people do not like the idea of having a special program, but I think it is handled well and it reaches children better than it would if we did not have the special milk program.

So, I have no criticism at all about the way it is being handled.

Mr. KLEPPE. I think, if I read you correctly, as far as you are concerned, the program is fine, but what we need to have is no cut off of the funding?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. KLEPPE. Thank you.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foley.

Mr. FOLEY. I do not have any questions, but I would like to compliment Mr. Quie. As we all know, he is a former and very highly respected member of this committee, and he is also very active in his concern for nutritional standards on the other committee on which he now serves, the Committee on Education and Labor. He has been one of the leaders along that issue, and I am glad to hear him here today advancing his cause on that score, as well as on the proposals we have before us for improving the performance of that program. I think that there are two parts of this program: increasing the farmer income and providing nutrition for all, especially younger Americans.

That was very well stated by Mr. Quie. I compliment him for his statement.

Mr. QUIE. Thank you, Mr. Foley.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Quie. We are pleased to have had you come before us.

We would like to have you come back anytime.

I understand Mr. Sebelius has a statement he would like to offer.

Mr. SEBELIUS. I would just like to offer it for the record, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be received.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF KANSAS

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to submit for the record my statement with regard to my support for H.R. 6641, a bill I introduced as a companion bill to H.R. 5554.

I wholeheartedly support H.R. 5554, introduced by our chairman, the Honorable W. R. Poage. This legislation will help to provide a constant and adequate supply of fresh milk to our nation's grade school children.

Mr. Chairman, all of us realize that our future rests in the hands of our most precious commodity—our children. Our future, their future, the very future of our nation depends, in part, on the health and education of our young people.

We know that proper nutrition is a prerequisite to an adequate learning process. I feel this legislation will help provide proper nutrition for our nation's elementary children.

In passing this legislation, we not only help safeguard the physical health of our children, but make their learning tasks easier and more meaningful.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe that is all of the members who would like to make a statement.

I would like to announce that the American Farm Bureau Federation supports the legislation, and Mr. Lynn and Mr. DeVaney are present, but they will forgo any appearance unless there is some reason for their appearing.

Frankly, I think that the members will be glad to move along as rapidly as possible, but we do appreciate the statement from the Farm Bureau.

Now, the next witness who has asked to appear is Mr. Glenn Lake, president of the National Milk Producers Federation.

Mr. Lake, we shall be glad to hear from you.

**STATEMENT OF GLENN LAKE, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL MILK
PRODUCERS FEDERATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Mr. LAKE. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

I might say it is a privilege to appear before this committee once again, more especially the full committee hearing addressed to this, I think, very important subject.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Glenn Lake. I live at North Branch, Mich. I am president of the National Milk Producers Federation, with offices at 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. I am also a dairy farmer and president of the Michigan Milk Producers Association, which is a marketing cooperative with headquarters in Detroit, Mich.

The National Milk Producers Federation welcomes this opportunity to present its views in support of permanent authorization and authority for sufficient appropriations to finance the special milk program for children.

Very briefly, the National Milk Producers Federation is a trade association. It represents dairy farmers, and the dairy cooperative associations which they own and operate, and through which they market the milk produced on their farms. The federation was organized in 1916. Its members are engaged in the marketing of milk throughout the 50 States of the Union.

The National Milk Producers Federation was a sponsor of the special milk program for children, and has given the program its full support ever since it was first authorized by Congress in 1954. The program was initiated for the dual purpose of encouraging increased consumption of milk by children as a nutritional measure, while at the same time reducing purchases of dairy products by the Commodity Credit Corporation, under the price support program authorized by the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The special milk program, in our opinion, represents one of the most outstanding enactments of the Congress in the interests of dairy farmers and of the public. It has achieved both goals as originally envisioned.

This program last year provided a market for some 1.6 billion pounds of milk for the benefit of some 17 million children of school age. The milk provided a return to farmers substantially higher than would have resulted had such milk been made into manufactured dairy products, and it did serve to reduce purchases of butter, nonfat dry milk, and cheese, by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The special milk program for children has had the full support of the U.S. Congress, of the educational system, of consumers, and of dairy farmers.

We have prepared two tables which are inserted in the testimony for your reference. The first discloses the number of schools and institutions participating in the program and the number of children participating for the fiscal years 1955 through 1968.

The second table shows the amount of milk served each year and the amount of butter and nonfat dry milk represented by this volume.

I would like to ask permission that the tables be incorporated into the record without taking time to read them.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the tables will be included.

Mr. LAKE. Thank you very much.

(The tables referred to read in full as follows:)

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

Amount of Milk Served, and Milk Served in Terms of Butter and Nonfat Dry Milk, Fiscal Years 1955-68

[In thousands of pounds]

Fiscal year	Milk served	Milk served in terms of—	
		Butter	Nonfat dry milk
1955.....	241,773	11,182	21,166
1956.....	749,395	34,660	65,606
1957.....	942,066	43,571	82,474
1958.....	1,031,016	47,684	90,261
1959.....	1,169,685	54,098	102,401
1960.....	1,281,776	59,282	112,214
1961.....	1,331,239	61,570	116,544
1962.....	1,414,150	65,404	123,802
1963.....	1,486,487	68,750	130,135
1964.....	1,574,354	72,814	137,828
1965.....	1,594,637	73,752	139,603
1966.....	1,644,280	76,048	143,949
1967.....	1,627,123	75,256	142,447
1968.....	1,631,682	75,465	142,846

Number of Schools and Institutions, and Number of Children Participating, Fiscal Years 1955-68

Fiscal year	Number of schools and institutions ¹	Number of children participating ² (million)
1955.....	41,094	2.5
1956.....	62,266	7.7
1957.....	71,239	9.7
1958.....	76,478	10.7
1959.....	81,587	12.1
1960.....	83,922	13.2
1961.....	86,494	13.8
1962.....	88,188	14.6
1963.....	90,486	15.4
1964.....	91,890	16.3
1965.....	92,005	16.5
1966.....	97,437	17.0
1967.....	95,139	17.0
1968.....	94,422	17.0

¹ Peak month nationally. Child care institutions did not participate in program during fiscal years 1955 and 1956.

² Estimated on basis of 180 schooldays per year.

Source: Reports CFPSS, C. & M.S., USDA.

Mr. LAKE. The steady growth of milk volume under this program, in itself, is evidence of its success. Under such a program, the amount of money involved is rather minimal, but it is necessary that sufficient funds be provided so that children may have the full advantage as intended by the legislation. Each year there has been a growth in the

number of schools and other institutions electing to participate, and there has been an increase in enrollment which is continuing at the present time.

The schools and other institutions which participate in the program have gone to some expense for equipment, personnel, and they have adapted their schedules to accommodate the milk break for children, or have provided facilities so that the milk may be available. From their standpoint, as well as from the viewpoint of dairy farmers, there should be assurance that the program will be continuing. The National Milk Producers Federation has always maintained that the program should be on a permanent basis and that there should be sufficient funds appropriated to carry out its goals, without impairment through reductions in rates of reimbursement or in any other manner.

We were indeed pleased when H.R. 5554 was introduced by the Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Poage—and we certainly again want to express our support and our appreciation for your concern, Mr. Chairman, on this important issue, along with that of Congressman Quie. The introduction of these bills and their consideration by this committee at this time is reassuring evidence that others agree with our position in this matter.

We were greatly disturbed by the budget message which recommended termination of the special milk program for children after fiscal year 1969. We do not propose at this hearing to discuss the national school lunch program except to state that we would support sufficient appropriations so that its full potential may be realized. We do not, however, agree with the recommendation in the budget message which would make the milk program a part of the lunch program.

The 1.6 billion pounds of milk distributed through the special milk program for children last year was in addition to an equal volume distributed with type A lunches under the school lunch program. A sizable quantity of the milk under the milk program was absorbed by the same children who receive a carton of milk as part of the school lunch.

It would be our view that if the two programs were combined, the distribution of milk would be limited to one-half pint per child, which by any measurement is inadequate. There may well be an increase in the number of type A lunches served, but the net result could only be less milk. For these reasons, it is our recommendation that the special milk program for children be maintained as separate legislation, and that it be funded with sufficient money so its full potential may be realized. If more money is needed for the school lunch program, it should be provided, but not at the expense of the milk program.

The present needs of the special milk program require the expenditure of approximately \$105 million this year; thus, it would appear that the \$125 million limitation as contained in H.R. 5554 should be sufficient for the time being.

There is no question in our minds but that the special milk program for children represents a very modest public expenditure, and that the dividends in improved nutrition are many times that sum. We are convinced this program, by encouraging greater milk consumption, serves to improve diets of all economic groups. Insofar as health is concerned, there is just as much need to encourage good nutrition among the children of the well-to-do or the great middle class, as well

as among those who may be impoverished. The special milk program for children is one that does not need to be "sold." It is a popular program, it serves a good purpose and it should be continued.

We are grateful that this committee is taking the leadership in seeing that this is done.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Lake.

I know that you are familiar with—shall I call it—the campaign which has been going on all over the United States for a good many months to point out the deficiencies in diet which exist in a large part of our population in this country. Originally, this campaign was directed on the claim that there was actual starvation all over the country. It seems that most of the evidence indicates that there is relatively little starvation throughout the United States, but that there is a considerable amount of malnutrition among our American people.

Is that not about what you found?

Mr. LAKE. Yes, I think that is quite true. I think that the committee is probably familiar with a report released in 1967 by the Department of Agriculture which indicates that there has been a decline, as a result of the study, in the good diets being followed. It is a case of probably not having and eating the right foods in many cases, rather than one that may be classified in the broad as impoverishment or malnutrition suffering or starvation, et cetera.

The CHAIRMAN. Is not this special milk program the one program of substantial magnitude in the United States which is directed not simply toward the alleviation of starvation but rather to preventing malnutrition?

Mr. LAKE. I think that the school—special school milk and along with it school lunch—programs are the two programs that I think certainly are most wise and most sufficient in providing the greatest amount of nutrition to a very important group of our society that we can point our fingers to. I think the milk programs are among the best.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, frankly, it would be my own feeling that this milk program, even more than the lunch program—and I certainly favor the school lunch program, but I look upon it as primarily a feeding program, primarily a program to provide food, some of which is nutritious, some of which is not.

Mr. LAKE. Right. Certainly, there is more nutrition provided through the special milk program than any other single program.

The CHAIRMAN. That is exactly right. The special milk program is a more direct attack upon malnutrition than any of our programs, and it would seem to me to be a great mistake to, just at this time when we are becoming aware of the fact that there is so-called hidden hunger, lack of nutrition, widespread in the United States—a great mistake to eliminate the one program which is most directly centered upon the elimination of malnutrition. What we are doing with this legislation is striking at malnutrition, not simply striking generally against hunger. We have a number of programs: the commodity distribution strikes at hunger, does it not?

Mr. LAKE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. But it may not give you a balanced diet.

Mr. LAKE. Correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The food stamp program offers opportunity to meet the hunger of the family, but unless there is some intelligent buying on the part of the housewife, it can still leave malnutrition.

Mr. LAKE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. So, I was pleased when you pointed out that it was just as important to see that the children of the well-to-do and the middle classes have this milk as it is to see that the poverty-stricken have the milk, because malnutrition runs all the way through our society; does it not?

Mr. LAKE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is really important to emphasize the fact that we are dealing with a nutritional problem here and not simply a feeding problem.

Are there others who want to question or comment?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Abernethy.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Lake, I do not see on the list of witnesses the name of anyone from the Department. I imagine there will be someone made available from the Department. I shall put my question to you, Mr. Lake. Maybe you can answer it.

Is there any formula by which these funds are divided among the States?

I shall put it another way: Does the Department utilize any particular formula in making these funds available to the States?

Mr. LAKE. I would have to say, sir, that I am not fully qualified to answer that, but I believe that, basically, the funds that are used to the extent that total funds are available are issued to States without regard to formula.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There have been a number of funds deposited in the Treasury. They have always utilized them, I am sure.

Mr. LAKE. That is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But I want to find out who is getting them and how they are related to the number of children. You do not have that?

Mr. LAKE. No, I do not, but I would be glad to provide to you whatever information I have.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That might be within the records of your fine organization. I intend to have the chairman call upon the Department to provide those tables, and, also, Mr. Chairman, if they could provide us with the formula—if they have a formula. I am sure there is no statutory formula. I would like to see what division is made of the funds and how they are made.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other questions?

Mr. Mayne?

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Lake, while it may be true that malnutrition runs through all classes, you would agree with me, would you not, that it certainly has a much higher incidence and is a much more serious problem among the poorer classes?

Mr. LAKE. Why, yes, I think, as a general statement, if you picked out the State-by-State distribution economically of our population, you would probably find more total nutritional deficiency among some of the poorer groups. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. MAYNE. And you would agree that it is, then, a more urgent problem, as far as the poor are concerned?

Mr. LAKE. If we are talking about the total, yes; I think it probably is more urgent. This program is an opportunity to provide better nutrition for the total cross section of our youngsters who, in the main, do not have an opportunity to make the decisions whether they have good nutrition at home or not. If milk is available at the schools—and many schools have indicated it is available—to this extent, they have an opportunity to get such important nutrients as calcium, and so forth, and some of the excellent proteins.

Mr. MAYNE. Well, in view of the fact that we are laboring under considerable financial stringency, do you not think that some priority should be given at this time in trying to relieve the problem in the area where it is most urgent?

Mr. LAKE. Well, I am sure that all of the dairy farmers who support the National Milk Producers Federation would share my view that, yes, we want to be sure that attention is given to the most areas that we can possibly reach with a practical, efficient program. But, in no case, should it be at the expense of a program as proven as this is. I think that is all we would say: Yes, wherever the Congress can find ways to give attention, but not at the expense—because you pick up all groups here, and I think all of our children are important.

Mr. MAYNE. What you are saying is that dollarwise you do not want to see the amount appropriated for this purpose to be diminished; are you not?

Mr. LAKE. Well, we are asking and suggesting, in our support of the legislation, that it needs to be increased. I think there is every justification for that. I am saying that it should be increased. I am not ruling against, or arguing against, other types and kinds of programs which might be initiated to strike at the so-called impoverished areas.

Mr. MAYNE. Well, assuming that the full \$125 million is appropriated, do you not think that at least some priority should be given in the allocation of those funds to see that those who most need better nutrition are taken care of first?

Mr. LAKE. I believe that if we look at our home school districts, and I know this is the case in my local school district, that there is a special effort made, not because of the legislation or the program itself, but I think you will find that many of the school districts do make special efforts to see that even the poorest of children, even though they cannot pay anything for the milk, do get the milk. I believe there is a pretty common practice on that. So, in that respect, the poor or those that are without funds to buy the milk or pay the small charge do, I think, get the milk. To that extent, we are reaching in, because the program makes the milk available.

Mr. MAYNE. Well, are you satisfied with the present breakdown of this distribution of milk, or do you think a greater effort should be made to bring it to those most vulnerable to malnutrition, in the poorer classes?

Mr. LAKE. I would hope that we could do more to bring it, make it more available, to some of those groups of children who may not have an opportunity to do it, to avail themselves of it. But I do believe we are making—Where the program is in, in fact—I cannot say this is the case where it is not being used by the school, but where those at schools that are using it avail themselves of it, I believe that in regard to the milk, during the school year, they are getting the milk.

Mr. MAYNE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Mayne.

Mrs. May?

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Lake, I would like to direct my question to the charts you have on page 2 of your testimony.

Mr. LAKE. Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. MAY. Just for clarification, would you tell me why your figures show that in 1966 through 1968, the number of schools and institutions participating have dropped and the number of children participating have seemed to stabilize for the 3 years there at 17 million?

Is there any significant reason for that?

Mr. LAKE. Congresswoman May, I believe that there may be several reasons. I am certain of one reason why the drop in number of schools is, and that is because—I know it is certainly true in my State of Michigan where there have been quite a number of consolidations in schools—the same school units are becoming one school system and are counted as one, as I understand it, in this count.

On the matter of the sort of leveling off or stabilization of numbers of children, I expect, again, there are a number of reasons. We are disturbed, but it does not show a continuing growth, because we know there is room for growth; in fact, there are some 15 million, I believe, yet to be reached in our school systems.

There are administrative problems, as I understand it and have been told by some of my friends that are in school administration, that they do run into certain problems, and they have not had some, what they might call, reasonable ways to include the special milk program in their school system.

I think, in the main, with the lack of adequate help in many of our schools and funds, and so on, that probably contributes to this, although I do not know what other reasons might have been considered.

Mrs. MAY. Thank you, Mr. Lake.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mathias.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Lake, what is your definition of a summer camp, a nonprofit summer camp?

Mr. LAKE. I believe that the understanding of the nonprofit summer camp is that the camps are made available for children in the summer-time under the sponsorship—and I will use this as an illustration: We have a newspaper in Detroit known as the Detroit Free Press which sponsors a summer camp, and most of these children that go there are invited from some of the indigent groups. Usually, they are paid for by individuals such as you and I. And then their programs are set up, and I think they can qualify for special milk to be served during these camp periods. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. MATHIAS. Do you consider a YMCA or Boy Scout summer camp—

Mr. LAKE. Yes, I would. I think, though I would not be certain—I believe that the Boy Scout camps might be considered, although I am not certain. I would think it applies more to the types of summer camps wherein city—so-called—children may have a little more opportunity to go than they may otherwise have. They may not even have an opportunity to be a member of the Boy Scouts, and so forth.

But they do get an invitation through the various social organizations to attend these camps, and I think they apply more there, perhaps, than any Boy Scout camps.

Mr. MATHIAS. In my area, most of the people who go to the Y camps are mostly middle-class people. They are not poor people. I think they should probably find a definition of summer camp.

I have a camp myself. The first couple of years, it was a nonprofit camp, even though I charged over \$100 a week for these boys to go there. I certainly would not want to get free milk for a camp charging \$100 a week for boys to go there.

Mr. LAKE. I think that is quite right.

Mr. MATHIAS. And I think there should be a definition of summer camps—

Mr. LAKE. If there is not an adequate definition now, I would agree, if it can be, that it should be spelled out so that private, so-called, camps would not be eligible for this.

Mr. MATHIAS. I notice you did not give Mr. Mayne a good answer on priorities. I think you are looking at the dollar value to the milk industry rather than the dollar value to our economy's health. We have to have priorities in some of these things, and you have not given us any.

Mr. LAKE. I can only say, sir, I tried to give you the answer as best I see it, and anyone who would choose to conclude that I would place more emphasis on the dollar value here, I can only suggest that you are really quite wrong, sir. It is a part of the program, we realize, but I personally believe in this milk program and its contribution to the nutrition of children.

Mr. MATHIAS. If this is right, in which way am I wrong?

Can you suggest that?

Mr. LAKE. I believe you suggested that I was looking only at the dollar value, and I am suggesting to you that that is not a fair conclusion. I am looking at both aspects of the program—the nutrition provided—and we do, as I say, recognize the dollar value.

Mr. MATHIAS. That is all I have.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Purcell.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Lake, to follow up a little bit on what Mr. Mayne was asking you, I do not often argue with my good friend from Iowa, but to pursue it a little bit further, is it not your opinion that although there should be priority to see that there is milk delivered to the poorer areas, the poorer areas do have priority enough to get this milk now? Isn't the main problem in getting these young people from at least the middle class and upper income areas provided with the kinds of foods they ought to eat, and do you not feel that further education or enforcement of what children know, by their parents, or those who sit in the position of parents, is really the basic problem that we are facing?

Mr. LAKE. Yes, it certainly is a basic problem. I happen to be very close to an officer in the National Dairy Council, which makes its sole business out of basic nutrition and the four basic food groups, but with emphasis on milk and dairy products. It certainly, with 53 years of activity and the very well established reputation as being noncommercial, and so forth, they show many tables and/or statistics indicating that very point you make, Congressman Purcell, is a part of the basic problem.

Mr. PURCELL. Do you happen to know whether or not the use of milk, from whatever source, in schools is lower at the high school level than it is at the junior high or elementary level?

Mr. LAKE. I do not have the per capita tables here, but my knowledge and recollection tell me that it does tend to decline in high school years, especially among the girls.

Mr. PURCELL. It is my opinion—let me just see if you agree with me—that teenage girls, maybe more than the boys, but certainly the girls, when they start worrying about their figure, about whether they are going to get fat or not, are going to drink the diet soda and eat potato chips, and they are not nearly as interested in wholesome foods or drinking milk as they were when they did not know that they were supposed to have a figure, and, basically, our problem is getting the parents and the young people to be more interested in their health in the long run than in whether or not they are cute at this particular period or not.

Mr. LAKE. That is a very real problem, and I do agree with you, and I think that there are many statistics to support that, that girls do tend to—well, I am recalling, and I cannot quote the per capita drop precisely, but I am recalling a graph shown by the American Dairy Association recently indicating that the boys continue on a pretty high level of milk consumption all the way through school, and, in fact, until marriage, but that girls begin at about 15 to drop away from, or back off from, milk consumption, and we see the graphs are going down quite markedly.

Mr. PURCELL. And unless we develop some way of making, or develop to where people want to be healthy, we are going to continue to have malnutrition among or in the middle of plenty, are we not?

Mr. LAKE. I think, Congressman Purcell, most people want to be healthy but they do not understand what you have to do to be healthy. I think many people are, in these times of pretty generally high-level prosperity, inclined to buy a lot of foods that are luxury-type foods, but they like them better. They may taste better, appeal better, and are promoted, and so on, causing them to eat or drink a lot of junk which may not be very good nutritionally and can cause someone that may know better and may want to be healthy not to follow a good diet. I think that might even be true of some of us adults, possibly.

Mr. PURCELL. Well, I do not think that we are the ones that are complaining about folks being hungry, either; are we?

Mr. LAKE. No.

Mr. PURCELL. I realize there are lots of fat Congressmen, but, at least, they have sense to know what is wrong with them.

Mr. LAKE. I think that is right.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Lake, I would just observe that as far as I am concerned, your job here is to sell this program because you are the president of the National Milk Producers Federation and we ought to have available to us other people whose specific job it is to know what the priorities ought to be, and if they will come up here we will find out from them. For whatever it is worth, I certainly do not look down on your presentation, because you are representing an organization that had better be interested in making some money out of it.

That is my contribution to today's hearing.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask Mr. Lake one question:

Could your interpretation of H.R. 5554 be that privately endowed nonprofit schools would be eligible for this special milk program?

Maybe the Chairman could also help you, since he introduced this bill.

Mr. LAKE. I think it might be better for Congressman Poage to respond to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Clearly, we have, in this bill, authorizations which enable the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage the use of fluid milk by children in nonprofit schools, high schools graded and ungraded and in nonprofit nursery schools. I think there is some—

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Most privately endowed schools are nonprofit, and if there is some malnutrition in these schools, it seems to me they would be eligible.

Is that your interpretation?

The CHAIRMAN. I think the answer is clearly "Yes."

Are there any other questions of Mr. Lake?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. If not, we are obliged to you, Mr. Lake. We appreciate your appearance.

The next witness is Mr. Walter Kirchner, of the Pure Milk Association of Chicago, Ill.

Before you begin, Mr. Kirchner, may I point out that the chairman will have to leave here by 11 o'clock to go over to the Rules Committee, who are now considering the request of this committee for authorization for the investigative staff. It is essential that we be there today. So, if Mr. Kirchner has not completed his statement by that time, the chairman will leave, Mr. McMillan will continue to hear him.

I hope you will understand.

STATEMENT OF WALTER C. KIRCHNER, TREASURER, PURE MILK ASSOCIATION

Mr. KIRCHNER. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Walter C. Kirchner, treasurer, Pure Milk Association, a producer-cooperative representing over 10,000 dairy farmers located in Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and a few in Michigan.

Pure Milk Association is a member of the National Milk Producers Federation and is in full support of the Federation's position. We endorse H.R. 5554 and the related bills which make available milk for some 17 million children of school age.

We have been particularly pleased with the special milk program because millions of children of school age have developed the healthful habit of drinking milk instead of trying to satisfy their appetites with products of questionable nutritional value. The program has a tremendous influence in increasing the consumption of milk among children of all economic groups. This is needed to encourage good nutrition in the upper- and middle-class children as well as the impoverished children who badly need upgrading in their diets.

The far-reaching effect of the special milk program is seen by the record which indicates that during the 1968 fiscal year, 3,035,687,000 half pints of milk were consumed by children across the Nation. In 1955, when the program was launched, the number of half pints of milk consumed as a result totaled 449,800,000.

Distribution of the benefits of this program have also been broad in terms of dollars. Federal expenditures to increase the consumption of milk through the special milk program in the fiscal year 1968 totaled \$6,609,572 in Illinois; \$3,631,136 in Wisconsin; \$2,908,256 in Indiana; and \$5,690,484 in Michigan. These expenditures in some other Midwestern States were \$6,558,623 in Ohio; \$2,661,275 in Minnesota, and \$2,308,693 in Missouri.

We feel that the special milk program has been properly administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and there is real need to make this program available to an increasing number of school-children, and it should be done on a permanent basis.

We wish to commend this committee for taking the leadership in getting this legislation enacted into law.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much for that statement.

Are there questions by the committee members?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. I guess you have convinced them.

We are very much obliged to you.

Mr. KIRCHNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness is Mr. Edwin Christianson, of the National Farmers Union. I see Mr. Johnson is appearing in his place.

STATEMENT OF EDWIN CHRISTIANSON, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, AS PRESENTED BY REUBEN L. JOHNSON, DIRECTOR, LEGISLATIVE SERVICES, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Christianson was torn between making an appearance before this distinguished committee this morning and meeting with his 120-farmer delegation, with Secretary Hardin, and at the last minute he decided he had better stay down and talk to Secretary Hardin. We have an annual program of flyins, as we call them. Some of you may have seen our people here on the Hill in the last couple of days.

Mr. Christianson asked me to bring his regards to the committee and for me to present the statement that he would be presenting here had he been here this morning.

We, in the Farmers Union, have been actively interested in assuring milk to little children since the days of the "penny milk" program in the early 1940's.

We were gratified in 1954, when the Congress, in its good judgment, launched the special milk program. Our spokesmen have appeared before this committee and the Appropriations Committee on numerous occasions to urge the extension of the milk program and to provide funds equal to the increase in participation.

We have also supported bills which would have increased the Federal assistance to the extent necessary to make the milk free of cost to the children.

Three years ago, we appeared before the agriculture committees to endorse a bill to make the special milk program permanent and to increase the maximum authorization.

We deeply appreciate the congressional support that has been given the special milk program over the years.

It is a program which has proved its worth in improving the nutrition and health of our children. We regard it as both an educational and a nutritional program, for it not only provides needed day-to-day nutrition but it also fosters good dietary habits.

But beyond its nutritional purposes, which are the main justification for the program, in our opinion, the special milk program is of economic importance to the dairy farmer as well.

Under the program, 1.6 billion pounds of fluid milk was consumed last year in the special milk program. Parenthetically, this is in addition to the 4.4 billion pounds of fluid milk and milk equivalent in the form of butter, cheese, and other dairy products consumed in the school lunch program.

The 1.6 billion pounds of milk is almost one and a half percent of the total production of 117.3 billion pounds.

The various dairy commodity programs under CCC diverted between 4 and 5 percent of the total milk volume.

If the 1.6 billion pounds had not been used in the school milk program, undoubtedly it would have been diverted in some other way to CCC.

Therefore, we maintain that eliminating the appropriations for the special milk program in the name of reduced spending is an illusion.

If we do not continue the very desirable program of incentives to get schoolchildren to drink the milk, there will only be a larger surplus in some other form for the CCC to contend with.

We believe this is true because, while wasteful overproduction has leveled off in the past 2 years, there is no evidence of an impending shortage of milk nationally.

The year 1969 may be off slightly in volume from 1968. Volume for the first quarter of 1969 is being projected as perhaps 1 percent or so lower than a year ago, but the volume will undoubtedly rally later on and the result for the year as a whole may be very close to 1968.

Further, the dairy economists look to 1970 and later years for some moderate upturn in milk volume.

We, therefore, see no need to terminate the special milk program on the grounds that a shortage will develop in the overall volume for the commercial market.

We commend the chairman of this committee for his sponsorship of the bill, H.R. 5554, to make the program permanent and to authorize an annual level of \$125 million.

We have previously stated before the Appropriations Committee that a fund increase of 5 to 6 percent a year is necessary to keep pace with growing participation and in order to hold the line on costs charged to the children.

Numerous research exists to show that the price of milk has a very direct bearing upon participation in the milk program.

Studies by the University of Illinois Department of Agricultural Economics reported that a 40-percent drop in milk consumption occurred in Chicago public schools as a result of an increase from 2 to 3 cents in the cost of a half pint of milk to the children. But while milk consumption dropped sharply in Chicago which raised the prices, consumption gained in the remainder of Illinois where the price had not changed.

We recognized that effective operations in a school depend on a reasonable volume of milk being handled. If the children are required to pay the full cost of the milk at the "milk breaks," participation could well drop so markedly that the school will find it impracticable to continue to offer the service.

We urge that the program be made permanent so that school boards and school officials can do their planning and budgeting in an orderly manner, knowing the rate of reimbursement on which they will be able to rely.

In the brief period of 15 years in which the milk program has been in operation, an excellent start has been made. Yet, only something more than one-third of the Nation's school-age children are benefiting.

In our testimony to be presented later this year to the House and Senate Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittees, we will ask that the program be fully funded. We anticipate that the \$125 million ceiling will someday have to be raised.

We believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is time to move ahead to extend and improve the program as you contemplate in your bill. We urge early action on your bill.

Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Are there questions by the members of the committee?

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. May.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Johnson, one of the statements, on the bottom of page 2, states "we have previously stated before the Appropriations Committee that a fund increase of 5 to 6 percent a year is necessary to keep pace with growing participation" by children in this program. And in Mr. Lake's statement, he included a chart which showed that there have been no increased participations in this program by children for 3 years. Would you have any background or information on how to respond to my question on why we have not had increased participation?

Mr. JOHNSON. At the time that we made these recommendations in regard to some 5 or 6 percent a year increase, it seems that we were having some increase each year in participation in the program.

Mrs. May, I don't have an answer to this question. But it is a very good question, and it seems to me it ought to be elaborated upon for the record, beyond the comment that I am able to make.

We have had \$103 million in the last year for the program.

What did we have previous to that?

Has not the amount of funds been somewhat stable over this period of time, and could that, by some chance, have set some ceiling on the money and, therefore, not in any way encouraged the administrator of the program to attempt to expand it?

That would be the only answer I would have.

Mrs. MAY. This is the question in my mind, if this is possibly a factor in there.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask the lady to yield?

Mrs. MAY. Surely.

The CHAIRMAN. The figures have shown a substantial reduction in the amount of money in 1968; 1967 had \$96 million, whereas there was only \$88 million provided in 1968. I think it was quite obvious; and

it was \$97 million provided in 1966. So, I think it is obvious that there could not be an increase in the number of students when we had some \$8 million less than we had in 1967 and \$9 million less than we had in 1966.

That is what happened to the amount of money that you had available.

Mrs. MAY. I see. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would certainly concur in the observations of the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other questions of Mr. Johnson?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. If not, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Johnson.

We appreciate your appearance.

Mr. William C. Eckles is our next witness.

Mrs. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, Dr. Miller is going to testify in Mr. Eckles' place.

The CHAIRMAN. I would state to Dr. Miller that Congressman Steiger had asked the privilege of introducing you, and we would be glad to have him do so, but he is tied up with something else.

STATEMENT OF DR. A. H. MILLER, PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE

Dr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the privilege of appearing this morning. Mr. Eckles was unable to be here: he had to be back in Wisconsin.

I am Dr. A. H. Miller, from the headquarters of Pure Milk Products Cooperative, Fond du Lac, Wis.

Pure Milk Products Cooperative, representing thousands of Wisconsin, Upper Peninsular of Michigan, and northern Illinois dairy farmers, strongly supports the prompt enactment of legislation to make permanent the authorization for appropriations to maintain and expand the special milk program for children in schools, nurseries, and day-care centers.

Our organization's thousands of dairy farmer members supply milk to over 200 processors and milk buyers in markets from central Indiana to Lake Superior. Many of these members supply grade A milk to fluid milk distributors. The other milk is marketed to processors who manufacture cheese, powdered milk, butter, and numerous other dairy products. In addition, members' milk production serves as a supplemental supply to many other fluid markets throughout the Nation in times when needs cannot be met adequately from local producer sources.

The school milk program has been, and will continue to be, of tremendous value in meeting the nutritional needs of millions of children, many of whom would otherwise go without the needed pure and wholesome milk. The program has gone far to improve dietary standards of students who would otherwise have settled for snacks and soft drinks which fall short of recommended nutritional needs and dietary minimums.

Our members can speak from experience. Many of their own children and related families enjoy the benefits of this outstanding and

highly acceptable program and its valuable contribution to their daily diet. Many farm children leave early in the morning, and hurriedly, for school, without adequate breakfast, but have an opportunity to make up for this lack of nourishment through the consumption of milk obtained in school under the special milk program. The program is equally valuable to both rural and urban children.

The school milk program has been of untold value in improving the health of American children and young people who have enjoyed participation in its benefits. It has developed dietary habits for citizens of the future and established a basis for development and maintenance of markets for hard-pressed farmers who are the backbone of American agriculture.

We believe it important that legislation be enacted which would provide for appropriations of not less than \$125 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; \$130 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; and \$135 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and thereafter. These increases are urged in recognition of the increasing number of schoolchildren who must be served as well as the inflationary spiral which is certain to result in increased costs each year to maintain supplies at a fixed level.

This school, camp, nursery, and day-care milk program is one of the most popular and worthy activities that has been instituted by the U.S. Congress. The growth in participation of the program is an indication of its popularity.

We urge prompt action to continue and expand this valuable program as proposed in both the House and the Senate by our own Wisconsin delegation and scores of other congressional representatives from many other States.

We wish to compliment you, Chairman Poage, and committee members for the early consideration given this important matter on your crowded legislative agenda.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN (presiding). Thank you, Dr. Miller.

We shall have our good friend, the Honorable Congressman from your section, Mr. Steiger, now.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. STEIGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would merely like to second what the representative of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, Dr. Miller, has said.

I have a statement which I will ask to be included in the record.

I am here to urge prompt action on the legislation.

I am delighted that you are holding hearings on this.

(The prepared statement presented by Mr. Steiger is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. Chairman—the outgoing administration in its budget proposals for fiscal 1970, has seen fit to seek a reordering of priorities in the Nation's food programs and the termination of the special school milk program. At a time when we are accumulating an ever-increasing body of knowledge indicating severe problems of hunger and malnutrition, the Congress has been asked to eliminate one of our most efficient and effective nutrition programs.

The desire to increase the Federal effort in the school lunch programs is commendable, but this action must not be taken at the expense of the special milk program. The net impact of the recommended changes will be a substantial reduction in the nutritional benefits provided for the Nation's schoolchildren.

In 1968, and again in 1969, approximately \$103.5 million was appropriated providing some 3 billion half pints of milk annually. The budget proposed for 1970 provides for no new appropriation; with some \$14.7 million carried over from prior years, the program will be carried on at a sharply reduced rate and then phased out entirely.

The Department of Agriculture has argued that this elimination of the milk program is justified on the grounds that other nutrition programs for children are being expanded, so that a larger portion of the Nation's young people will receive lunches through the school lunch program. They also suggest that the transfer of funds will not result in any reduction in the amount of milk actually consumed because each new lunch provided for in the budget will include milk. I find, using information from the budget, that this is not the case; indeed that the elimination of the milk program coupled with the increase in the lunch and breakfast programs will actually reduce the amount of milk consumed by approximately 2 billion half pints annually. Once the \$14.7 million remaining in the milk fund is expended, the consumption of milk by the Nation's schoolchildren will be cut back even more sharply.

It has been estimated that some 66 percent of the 51 million schoolchildren have benefited from the milk program. Only 44 percent will benefit from the school lunch, special assistance, and breakfast programs after they are expanded. Approximately 94,500 schools and institutions have participated in the milk program. Under the proposed expanded nutrition programs only 82,000 schools will be included.

I am unable to comprehend the reasoning behind the changes in the proposed budget. The National Nutrition Survey now underway under the auspices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare points to severe problems of malnourishment, especially among younger age groups. Other studies such as "Their Daily Bread: A Study of the National School Lunch Program," have pointed up the inadequacies of our present efforts:

(1) Of 50 million public elementary and secondary school children, only about 18 million participated in the National School Lunch Program. Two out of three children do not participate.

(2) Of 50 million school children, fewer than two million, just under four percent, are able to get a free or reduced-price school lunch.

(3) Whether or not a child is eligible for a free lunch is determined not by any universally accepted formula, but by local decisions about administration and financing which may or may not have anything to do with the need of the individual child. And generally speaking, the greater the need of the children from a poor neighborhood, the less the community is able to meet it.

With respect to the special milk program, "Their Daily Bread" reported the following:

(1) The great majority of schools in the communities surveyed are included in the special milk program.

(2) The federal government reimburses more than half the cost of the first pint of milk served with lunch and slightly more on every half pint served after that. This means that out of what the children pay on the balance, plus special reimbursement based on the number of half pints served free, there is enough money to serve milk free to needy children—a far higher percentage than receive a free lunch.

From these two factors alone, it is easy to see that the milk program is working well.

In spite of all of these findings, and in spite of the fact that elimination of the milk program will reduce the nutritional services provided our schoolchildren, the authors of the new budget have asked us to abdicate our responsibilities and accept their suggested priorities for Federal nutritional efforts. I, for one, am not prepared to support these recommendations. In the past I have worked actively for basic improvements in programs designed to insure the fulfillment of the nutritional needs of every American. I intend to support such efforts this year, including the expansion and upgrading of the school lunch program.

Nonetheless, until such time as the responsible executive agencies can guarantee that all of the Nation's schoolchildren, and in particular those living in poverty,

will receive nutritionally adequate and nourishing meals, no effort should be made to eliminate already proven programs designed to provide badly needed dietary supplements. Specifically, no action should be taken that will reduce the milk consumption of the Nation's children by some 2 billion half pints annually.

You are now considering H.R. 5554, a bill to provide for continuation of the special milk program at a level of some \$125 million annually. I wish to lend my whole-hearted support to this measure, and to urge immediate and favorable consideration of the bill by your committee and the Congress.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Mr. Steiger.

Are there any questions?

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, for the record, it seemed to me that a lot of this testimony this morning leaves the thought that there is an overproduction of milk. I wonder if counsel or anyone could find out for the record the amount of powdered milk or milk byproducts being imported into this country?

I understand that dairy products imports increased 300 percent last year.

Does anyone have any figures as to whether there is any milk in any form being imported into this country?

Mr. McMILLAN. We will try to find out if there is and how much, and we will try to get it in this record.

Mr. PRICE. I just felt we were left with the feeling that there is an overproduction, and I feel there are a lot of imports coming in.

Mrs. MAX. Dr. Miller might be able to answer that.

Dr. MILLER. Certainly, there have been some quotas of products coming into this country. The quotas that have been instituted recently have kept this in the future; provided these are effective, these exporters in other countries who would like to ship their products here have been very astute in finding loopholes and ways to get around it. But at the time, the imports did approach 3 million pounds. I believe the quotas have cut that in half now.

Mr. PRICE. Is there any form, though, that they are shipping this milk from overseas in here—we will say powdered form?

Do you know of any instance if there is imported powdered milk of any other form being used in our school lunch program in place of milk from our own producers?

Dr. MILLER. Not to my knowledge, that I used in this school milk program, no. There are specific products which find their way into the market and, as such, would displace domestic products in open-market sales.

Mr. PRICE. But there are none in any kind or form entering into this country that you would know of, as far as milk is concerned?

Dr. MILLER. I would not say there are not any, but I do not know of any.

Mr. PRICE. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Any further questions?

(No response.)

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Dr. Miller and Congressman Steiger. We are glad to have had you.

Is there anybody else present to testify on this legislation?

(No response.)

Mr. McMILLAN. The Honorable Vernon W. Thomson of Wisconsin has submitted a statement which will appear in the record at this point.

(The prepared statement submitted by Mr. Thomson reads as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. VERNON W. THOMSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my alarm over former President Johnson's budget proposal to phase out the Special Milk Program for school children, and my support of the measures before you today which insure the continuance of this notable program.

Since established in 1954, billions of half-pints of milk have been provided to millions of school children, and the program has been a primary factor in aiding them to establish proper dietary habits for physical growth and development. It has supplemented the nutritional dietary needs of these children, and if anything should be increased, not eliminated.

Moreover, the budgetary savings sought to be achieved by a cutback in the Special Milk Program are more illusory than real. The program is presently funded out of Commodity Credit Corporation appropriations and represents an attempt to assure the most worthwhile use for government-purchased commodities. In other words, rather than simply purchasing surplus milk commodities and storing them away in government warehouses, we have established a program designed to put these commodities to good use. It is difficult to envisage a better use than supplying our youngsters with much-needed nutrition from "nature's most nearly perfect food." If the surpluses are not used for this laudible purpose, they will simply revert back to the former use, with no discernible saving to the taxpayer.

Proponents of the program's discontinuance argue that the fulfillment of the nutritional needs of these young people will be maintained by increases in other phases of the Child Nutrition Program, and that in fact the over-all expenditures for Fiscal 1970 will be some \$20 million over Fiscal 1969. Unfortunately, there is no evidence proffered that the number of children who will be receiving the benefits of the new arrangement will even equal, let alone exceed, the number presently benefitting. In fact, it seems likely that less children will be involved at a higher cost.

The rebuttal then comes that the children under the new arrangement will be more needy than many of those under the present system. But the problem is in distinguishing who is more needy, a task not easily met. The decisions cannot be made on a school by school basis, because there will certainly be children of this category in almost every school district.

If it be true that our present Special Milk Program and School Breakfast and Lunch programs are not adequately meeting the needs of our youngsters, then the answer does not lie in compromising one worthwhile program for the sake of the other.

The future growth and development of our great Nation directly depends on the health and educational performance of the young people now in our schools, and the Special Milk Program is essential to both.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge your favorable consideration of the proposals before you today, H.R. 5554 and other Bills, which extend and expand this vital program.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, if there is no other person here to testify on this matter, I would like to move that we go into executive session for the discussion of another matter.

Mr. McMILLAN. Without objection, the committee will go into executive session.

(Whereupon, at 11:05 a.m., the committee retired into executive session.)

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1969

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 1301, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Purcell, de la Garza, Vigorito, Jones, Montgomery, Sisk, Alexander, Belcher, Teague of California, May, Wampler, Goodling, Miller, Mathias, Mayne, Zwach, Kleppe, Sebelius, McKneally, and Mizell.

Also present: Christine S. Gallagher, clerk; William C. Black, general counsel; John A. Knebel, assistant counsel; and L. T. Easley, staff consultant.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

This morning, we are honored to have with us the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Lyng, who will testify with regard to the extension of the special school milk program.

The CHAIRMAN. We shall be glad to hear from you, Mr. Lyng. We are pleased to have you with us.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of Mr. Sisk, Mr. Mathias, and myself, we would like to join in extending words of welcome to Secretary Lyng, inasmuch as Mr. Lyng has been and is a very prominent Californian.

Mr. SISK. I will join my good friend, Charlie, in that remark.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD E. LYNG, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, ACCOMPANIED BY ROY W. LENNARTSON, ADMINISTRATOR, CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE, AND SAMUEL C. VANNEMAN, ASSISTANT DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, CONSUMER FOOD PROGRAMS, CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. LYNG. Mr. Chairman, members of the Agriculture Committee, it is a pleasure for me to be here this morning. I have with me Mr. Roy Lennartson on my left, Administrator of the Consumer Marketing Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee knows and is glad to have Mr. Lennartson.

Mr. LYNG. Also Mr. Sam Vanneman, who is Assistant Deputy Administrator, Consumer Food Programs, Consumer and Marketing Service.

The CHAIRMAN. We welcome him.

Mr. LYNG. We are pleased to appear before this committee to discuss the Department's Child Nutrition Program and its relation to H.R. 5554 and related proposals which provide authority for the conduct of a special milk program. I should point out at the outset that the administration has not had an opportunity to assess this legislation in relation to the 1970 budget for the child nutrition programs as a whole, which is currently under review.

We are sufficiently advanced, however, in our thinking to discuss some of the objectives which we believe a child nutrition program should achieve. These objectives and the resources required for them will have a direct impact on our position with respect to the special milk program. They are:

To provide as many children as possible with an opportunity to obtain a complete school lunch, including milk.

To provide needy schoolchildren a free or reduced-price lunch, including milk.

To make available subsidized milk until such time as the school provides full lunch facilities.

To expand the breakfast program in which milk is a major component into schools needing such a program.

To make the lunch program available to nonschool feeding programs, such as child care centers, settlement homes, and summer activities.

To assist schools or school systems install lunch preparing facilities in individual schools and central commissary arrangements where necessary.

It is obvious that such goals will require significant resources in the immediate years ahead. However, the resources to seek these goals must be sought within overall budgetary and fiscal policies.

We are quite mindful of the nutritional attributes of making milk available to children. However, we want to assure that all children will have available not only a half pint of milk, but a full nutritional lunch which will include additional dairy products.

Milk consumption under the special milk program in recent years has averaged about 3 billion half pints yearly. It is natural, therefore, that milk producers are concerned over the possibility of losing such a market. This will not likely happen because:

The great bulk of milk consumed under the special milk program occurred in schools having lunch facilities readily available. Milk will continue to be available in these schools.

Children buying milk to supplement their bag lunch or items from the snackbar will continue to do so. The added 3 or 4 cents in cost will not likely deter them.

Expansion of the full lunch program to needy children and to those additional children in schools not now providing lunches will offset the milk previously consumed under the special milk program.

That concludes my prepared testimony, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Lyng. I must confess I do not know which side you are on. Do I understand that you are opposed to the extension of this program?

Mr. LYNCH. No, Mr. Chairman. We were unable to assess the legislation completely because of the considerations that are now going on in the 1970 budget. We just have not had word that would permit us to take that kind of position.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly, it has never been the intention of the chairman of this committee nor of any member of this committee to want to insist on an answer that the Department apparently can't give at this time. When do you think you will be ready to give us an answer?

Mr. LYNCH. I am afraid that it's going to take possibly as long as 3 weeks before we can.

The CHAIRMAN. That probably means that it will be the Easter recess before you are ready and it means it will be the latter part of April before you can expect to come up with an answer?

Mr. LYNCH. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that is about the case, because we are doing a complete study of the whole food and nutrition programs.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean that the committee ought to wait until the latter part of April? That we should not even take committee action until late in the spring? That means it will be somewhere well up in the summer before we can have any legislation. Do you feel we ought to keep this thing in suspension, break the market and disrupt the whole dairy business that long?

Mr. LYNCH. Well, Mr. Chairman, I really do not want to suggest that the committee necessarily wait that long if the committee feels that this will be the effect.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you would not feel that we were ignoring proprieties if the committee went ahead and acted?

Mr. LYNCH. No; that is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Belcher?

Mr. BELCHER. I have no questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anybody else have any questions?

If not, you must have convinced them.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Alexander.

Mr. ALEXANDER. You mention here in the first part of your testimony that you have been unable to reach a decision because of the budgetary situation and no conclusion has been reached with reference to the fiscal 1970 budget. Down on the last page, the last paragraph of your testimony, you say that expansion of the full-lunch program to needy children and those additional children in schools not now provided lunches will offset the milk previously consumed under the special milk program.

Do you mean by that, sir, that you or your Department are trying to develop a lunch program which will take the place of milk that has been previously consumed in the special milk program?

Mr. LYNCH. Well, Mr. Alexander, I think that it is probably well known that the Department has made proposals along this line. Whether this will be in the final proposal that we will come up with after reevaluation, I can't say at this time. But we were, in this statement, attempting to give reassurance to the dairy industry particularly that this type of change would not necessarily mean a severe reduction in the amount of milk consumed.

Mr. ALEXANDER. For the purposes of our edification here and for the purposes of the record, would you mind generally stating the alternatives that have been proposed by the Department which would take the place of milk, for the record?

Mr. LYG. Inasmuch as this is a historical thing, if I might, Mr. Alexander, I would like to defer to Mr. Lennartson or Mr. Vanneman to answer this.

Mr. VANNEMAN. Well, I think you can read from the current budget proposals that are before Congress that the proposed very large increase of about \$60 million in money to feed needy children, to the extent to which this is accomplished, the children will be receiving a full lunch with milk and these are children who are now only receiving milk, so that they will not lose this consumption. In fact, many of them are not even receiving milk at this point. So by moving them into a complete lunch with milk, we are, in this respect, adding to milk consumption.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Then the answer to the question is that you propose an additional complement of food to the lunch program which would expand the consumption of the milk?

Mr. VANNEMAN. This is a matter which Secretary Lyng referred to as being under consideration. These decisions have not yet been made.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I see.

Would you mind defining what you mean by a "full-lunch program?"

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the witness would use the microphone? I think some are having difficulty in hearing him.

Mr. VANNEMAN. The full-lunch program is that which is operated under the National School Lunch Act, which is designed to achieve one-third of the child's daily nutritional requirements. Each lunch must include a half pint of milk, a protein food and fruits and vegetables as well as bread, margarine or butter. In order to qualify for reimbursement the school must agree to serve a complete lunch.

Mr. ALEXANDER. One further question: Do you plan to offer these alternatives by way of testimony to the committee within the 3-week projection that Mr. Secretary indicated a minute ago?

Mr. LYG. Mr. Alexander, these will be recommended in terms of a total program which will be reflected in the budget proposal of the Department.

Mr. ALEXANDER. And you, as I understand it, intend to have your budget proposals prepared and ready for presentation in about 3 weeks?

Mr. LYG. This is my understanding.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kleppe?

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lyng, I am very glad to see you up here and testifying on this important legislation. I consider it very vital and very important, and I am particularly pleased with the answers you gave to the chairman. I do, however, have a question here that I do not know the answer to. It has to do with the last paragraph on the second page.

When you refer to the added 3 or 4 cents in cost, will this not likely deter children from buying milk for their bag lunch—would you qual-

ify or explain that to me, please? What added 3 or 4 cents are you talking about?

Mr. LYNG. Mr. Kleppe, this is really the amount of the subsidy under which we have been giving special milk to all children in the schools. If there were a modification, this is really speaking to one of the alternatives Mr. Alexander earlier referred to.

Mr. KLEPPE. You are not referring to any additional 3 or 4 cents above and beyond what has been practiced in the past?

Mr. LYNG. This is correct. This is referring to a modification in the special milk program, this is one of the alternative possibilities that we suggest would not diminish the total consumption of milk.

Mr. KLEPPE. That clarifies my point.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, Mr. Sisk.

Mr. SISK. The question arose with reference to proposals in the budget. The figure of an additional \$50 or \$60 million for the regular school lunch program to broaden its coverage would not take care of the milk that is needed and proposed in this particular legislation. We are talking about a \$125 million program. In fact, it goes to \$135 million after the third year. Mr. Secretary, we are discussing and proposing about twice as much money as the budget proposal. I recognize that studies must be made, but certainly, you must agree that the budget proposal would in no sense provide the amount of milk we are discussing in this particular legislation.

Mr. LYNG. That is correct in that proposal, that it would not provide an equivalent amount of milk to what has been obtained or used at public expense.

Mr. SISK. I hope the Department keeps this in mind, because I do feel this program has proven its effectiveness as a milk supplement. I am not opposed to a broadening of the school lunch program. Evidence presented to this committee has indicated there is a definite need to broaden our feeding program in schools. Hungry children apparently do not learn as well as a child who has a reasonably decent diet. There is no reason why the special milk program and the school lunch program can not be continued and expanded. I hope this is kept in mind as the Department looks at this situation within the next few weeks.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, Mr. Montgomery.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I am sorry Mr. Abernethy is not here today. He is sick, but he was quite interested in talking to officers of the Department of Agriculture, pertaining to the type of formula that has been used in the past to distribute funds for the milk program.

Could you explain to me what formulas you have or do you even have a formula for the milk program or what plans do you have in the future as far as a formula is concerned?

Mr. VANNEMAN. We have a formula which is set forth in the regulations for the program. It goes approximately like this:

One percent of the funds are withheld. All the rest of the money, 99 percent, is apportioned on the basis of the use of funds in each State in the previous year. In other words, if State A used 3 percent of the funds last year, they would get 3 percent of the funds this year.

The 1 percent is withheld for any type of emergency situation, where a State has some very large, unexpected increase in participation. We, therefore, can take care of that kind of situation.

This is a formula which has been in the regulations for quite some time.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Are funds withheld, these milk funds, withheld if a school is involved in any type of guideline court suits or guideline disputes? Are these funds withheld for this program to these children?

Mr. VANNEMAN. They are not withheld with respect to public schools. We continue both school milk aid as well as school lunch aid to any public school. We are not actually subject to title VI provisions with respect to school feeding.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. How about privately endowed schools that operate on a nonprofit basis?

Mr. VANNEMAN. They fall into a different category. In the discussion and debate on the Civil Rights Act, the exemption applied to the school lunch program and the milk program for public schools, not for private schools. So any private school which has admittedly a policy of segregation would not be eligible for the milk program or for the lunch program.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You said that 99 percent of this money must be allocated on the same basis as it was allocated last year; is that right?

Mr. VANNEMAN. Based on the use of the funds last year.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, now. The State of Texas did use some of it, I'm sure. But suppose we did not use any of it last year. Does that mean we could never get into the program?

Mr. VANNEMAN. Technically, yes; but as a practical matter, every State has been in the program since it began in 1954.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they frozen to the percentage that they took in 1954 and no State can increase its participation in this program? Is that the situation?

Mr. VANNEMAN. This is a formula—well, first of all, the act does not set forth any formula. After several years of experience, when the program had leveled off in each State, we thought the fairest way, and the States did, too, was to provide this money on the basis of usage in the previous year. I do not think there have been any complaints on this system. There have been some complaints made that there has not been enough money from time to time.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask, then, does this mean that Mississippi can never get any of this money?

Mr. VANNEMAN. No; Mississippi is sharing in this money now and will continue to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. But you have just told us that if they have private schools and they do not meet the criteria of the Department of Education as to segregation, they cannot get any of the money.

Mr. VANNEMAN. That only applies to a particular private school. All the public school systems in Mississippi are eligible for this money and are receiving it.

The CHAIRMAN. This special milk program applies primarily to those nonprofit institutions, does it not?

Mr. VANNEMAN. Well, the school lunch program is available to any public or private nonprofit school, as well as to child care institutions

and summer camps, all of which have to be nonprofit. The only place where title 6 applies is in the case of a private school which has a policy of segregation. All other schools in that State, public schools, will continue to participate regardless of what that private school did.

The CHAIRMAN. We are talking about a "special milk program" which applies to nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, and nonprofit nursery schools, childcare centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children.

That is what we are talking about.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be clearly understood that the great bulk of this moves into the public schools in all of the States and that the private schools that are affected by this civil rights problem are very, very few. Perhaps Mr. Vanneman could tell us roughly how many schools actually have problems in this area.

Mr. VANNEMAN. I think there are much less than a dozen, probably not more than four or five private schools that have applied for the program but are not willing to comply with title VI. For these schools, we have not been able to give assistance. The only impact so far—

The CHAIRMAN. Title VI of what?

Mr. VANNEMAN. Of the Civil Rights Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Not of the milk program?

Mr. VANNEMAN. Oh, no, I meant the Civil Rights Act.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, may I insert this? I asked this same question, "If privately endowed schools were eligible for the special milk program," and I got an answer back from the Department of Agriculture and they said:

Any nonprofit school of high school grade or under is eligible. This includes parochial schools or privately endowed nonprofit schools which are exempt from Federal income tax.

They did not mention anything in here about title VI or whether schools would be eligible or not if they were under desegregation disputes. So we are getting two answers.

The CHAIRMAN. I know. You get two or more answers every time you raise this question. But you can be sure you will not get any help if you prefer to maintain separate private schools.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I am talking mainly about privately endowed schools.

The CHAIRMAN. I was, too. I am not blaming the Department of Agriculture.

Are there any other questions? We are getting a long way off.

Yes, sir?

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Vanneman, did I understand you to say that all public schools in Mississippi are eligible and are, in fact, receiving milk under this program?

Mr. VANNEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MAYNE. Thank you.

Mr. VANNEMAN. All public schools.

Mr. MAYNE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. If not, we are greatly obliged to you. We are glad to have you come up. You know, Mr. Lyng, we will be calling on you again. We are glad you could come by. We are always glad to have you come by here.

(The following statements were also submitted to the committee:)

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF VERMONT

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make this statement a part of the official record on the hearings which you are holding on H.R. 5554, to provide a special milk program for children.

I commend you, Mr. Chairman, for introducing this important legislation, and assure you of my wholehearted and strong support for the purposes of this bill.

During the previous eight years that I have served the people of Vermont in the House of Representatives, I have given unqualified and active support to the special milk program. In 1966, I testified before your committee in support of expanding the school milk program to include other non-profit institutional use of milk such as in summer camps, nursery schools and childcare centers. This was done under the provisions of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

I am pleased to now join you in strongly urging adoption of H.R. 5554, which would increase the authorization under the special milk program to \$125,000,000 for the next fiscal year, and then—even more importantly—put this program on a permanent basis by authorizing like expenditures for each succeeding fiscal year.

This program is of vast importance to the people of Vermont, not only to our young people who will benefit from receiving the milk, but to our most vital dairy industry, which remains the backbone of our agricultural economy in the northeast.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I welcome this opportunity to appear in support of a program that has increasingly proved its worth every year since its authorization in 1954.

It would be difficult, I am sure, to find many voices raised in opposition to the objectives of the Special Milk Program for children, for the value of daily milk to the health of our children is self-evident. In view of the some 17 million children who benefited from the program last year it is clear that we have here an especially valuable program that deserves special consideration and special treatment.

For this reason, I am deeply concerned by the proposal to eliminate the Special Milk Program as a separate operation and combine it with the regular school breakfast and lunch programs. These last two are worthwhile plans too and, standing on their own merits, deserve support. However, there is great risk that if we combine Special Milk with the regular programs the Special Milk Program will lose the separate attention it deserves, and then may well lose its identity too. I have real apprehension that a combined program would actually result in a reduction of funds for the Special Milk Program and consequently would mean less milk to our children.

All children need the food and nourishment value of daily milk, and children from middle-income families are no exception. It is important to encourage good health and diet habits in *all* children. The Special Milk Program has been a very great step in that direction.

There are recognized statistics to indicate that the per capita consumption of milk is decreasing. When we consider this in terms of the effect upon the health of the nation and the effect on the economy represented by our dairy farmers, it is obvious that we must be seeking ways to reverse the trend rather than considering a proposal that could quite possibly reduce milk consumption even further.

The Special Milk Program for children is a *special* program with *special* benefits and values, and it needs *special* attention to support and expand it. A perma-

ment authorization is called for in order to take it out of the category of a sometime program and recognize its real and permanent contribution. I fully support the legislation to provide such a permanent authorization.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to indicate my strong support for retention and expansion of the Special Milk Program.

The Special Milk Program has been and continues to be important, not only to the producer, the dairy farmer in my state and in the country—but to the user, the thousands of children in schools, nurseries and day care centers who have benefitted nutritionally from this addition of milk to the daily diet.

As I understand it, the termination of the Special Milk Program has a wholesome, but unfortunately theoretical, objective. The program is, in effect, supposed to become a part of the School Lunch Program which is to be expanded in fiscal 1970. I certainly applaud the proposed expansion of the School Lunch Program and am pleased to note that the Executive Branch architects of the program are providing that milk will be included in all meals on the grounds that the total nutritional value of the food service will be enhanced by the inclusion of milk in the daily diet. This is commendable.

There are some aspects and implications of the proposal, however, that are not entirely clear to me and because of this I must speak against the proposal and in favor of the retention and expansion of the Special Milk Program as a separately identified and separately funded program. The outgoing Administration, in its budget proposal, states that expansion of the School Lunch Program for fiscal year 1970 “* * * will result in increased milk consumption with the additional meals to be served. This eliminates the necessity for a separate special milk program appropriation.” The key phrase here is “increased milk consumption with the additional meals.” Does this mean that more children will be furnished milk, or that more children eating lunches will be provided milk as an accompaniment to that lunch?

These are two quite different things. In the case of the former, the total amount of milk provided our children would increase in absolute terms. In the case of the latter, the total amount of milk made available would decrease in absolute terms. It would decrease because the total number of lunches made available, in this first year at least, will in no sense come close to equaling the number of units of milk available under the school milk program.

I have also been told that “substantially all of the one hundred and three million dollars made available under the Special Milk Program will re-appear in the School Lunch Program.” Ignoring for the moment the question of whether a one hundred and three million dollar program provides adequate coverage, I wonder what “substantially all” means and where it is in the proposed budget. (The proposed increase for the “expanded” School Lunch Program is only about one hundred and fifteen million dollars.) I wonder, too, about the 30,000 or so participant schools in the current milk program that do not have facilities to provide lunch. The budget statement does speak to this point in a negative fashion: “[This will] confine any milk-only assistance that is necessary in schools without lunch facilities to a partial year in 1970, until arrangements can be made for serving lunches.” This statement would seem to imply, rather optimistically, that full coverage of lunch room facilities will be realized in fiscal year 1970—the first year of the program. I doubt that 100% conversion can be realized in the first year; the first ten years would probably be more realistic. In the meantime, children not furnished lunches must either (a) go without milk, or (b) have milk provided for them under a special program.

Since we already have such a program, the Special Milk Program, I would urge that we keep it. It has worked well and it has provided broad coverage. Because it is a special program, we have assurances we would not otherwise have that it is meeting the needs of our young people as the Congress intended. Such assurance would not continue if the Milk Program were to be merged with the Lunch Program.

STATEMENT OF HON. ANTONIO B. WON PAT, GUAM'S REPRESENTATIVE IN
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Antonio B. Won Pat, the elected Representative in Washington from the Territory of Guam. First, let me thank you on behalf of the people of Guam for the privilege of presenting to this Committee my comments regarding H.R. 5554—the "Special Milk Program".

Guam was not included in the original special milk program which was authorized by Section 3 of Public Law 89-642, the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. Our exclusion from a major benefit of that Act—to encourage consumption of fluid milk by children in the United States—arises from the fact that surplus "whole milk" cannot be transported from the mainland. As you know, our geographical location makes the importation of whole milk impractical and recombined or reconstituted milk is used by the island populace as well as by all Armed Forces personnel stationed in the Territory. Guam does not have dairy herds and there is little hope that they will be developed in the foreseeable future. A few farmers raise milk cows for their own use but whole milk is not produced for sale on the open market. We are particularly deficient in the nutritive values which milk provides. The milk program is very important to Guam because of the economic hardship of many children, and especially because many families are incapable of acquiring adequate nutritive food.

However, in the case of Alaska and Hawaii, an administrative change of Department of Agriculture Regulations permits the serving of recombined or reconstituted milk in milk deficient areas in those states under the Special Milk Program. In view of the situation on Guam, I earnestly request that the Act be amended to include Guam in the definition of "United States" by adding ". Guam," between "* * * states" and "and the District of Columbia." This will permit us to participate in the program and provide our children with better nutrition, and authorize the Department of Agriculture to provide surplus ingredients in lieu of whole milk.

Recombined milk, which is presently served to our school children in conjunction with the School Lunch Program, contains powdered skim milk, at least three and one-half percent anhydrous fats and all the normal elements which are found in whole milk are present in the recombined product, including proteins, minerals and vitamins. The milk is homogenized and pasteurized in accordance with the U.S. Public Health Code. The milk is produced by the International Dairy Supply Company, a subsidiary of Foremost Dairies, in a new and modern plant erected approximately five years ago. The skim milk powders and anhydrous fats are imported from the Western States, mainly from California, Washington, Oregon and Idaho.

An average of 45,000 one-half pints of milk are furnished our school children monthly in conjunction with the School Lunch Program and it is anticipated that this figure would be increased by one-third if we were to participate in the Special Milk Program, which would enable us to furnish better nutrition to the school children. This volume is small when compared to other areas in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I again wish to thank you and the Members of this Committee for this opportunity to present my views.

Thank you very much!

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. SCOTT, MASTER, THE NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

The Grange is pleased to testify in favor of H.R. 5554, an Act to Amend Sec. III of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, introduced by the distinguished Chairman of this Committee.

We commend the Chairman for taking the leadership in introducing legislation to expand and make permanent the special milk program contained in the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. The Grange supported this legislation when it was first introduced in 1966 and approved of the move to bring the school lunch funding and special milk programs under one Act, hoping that it would bring the permanence and stability it properly deserved.

It is our understanding that the Bureau of the Budget has recommended that the Special Milk Program be phased out and become a part of the over-all school lunch program. The Grange is opposed to this move to dilute the importance of the Special Milk Program, as we feel that it will not be in the best interest of the children, nor will it help to expand the use of dairy products.

We do not believe we have to document this statement with scientific facts regarding the benefits to child nutrition from the increased use of whole fluid milk. The recent findings of this Committee and other investigating committees of Congress document well the need for increased use of our food abundance to provide the minimum daily requirements of essential nutrients to our school children. It becomes more important when we consider the fact that, in many cases, this is the only whole fluid milk that many of our boys and girls receive.

The record shows that the special school milk program has made real progress since its beginning in 1954, with significant increases in school participation and milk consumption by school children. In 1961, 2.5 million half-pints of milk were distributed under the program. In 1968, this figure grew to 3.5 billion half-pints of whole fluid milk consumed by children in schools, nurseries and day care centers. This is a fine record, but it also means that we have not yet exhausted the full potential of the program to reach children in need of the nutritional benefits of milk.

The \$5 million proposed increase provided for in H.R. 5554 will purchase approximately 700 million additional half-pints of milk for the Special Milk Program, a modest sum and a modest addition to the health and well-being of our school children. In light of the recent findings by other agencies of Government, can we afford to do so little?

The Grange does not believe that this is the time to be trying to phase out the Special Milk Program or even stabilize it, which is what we fear will happen if funds for the program are considered an over-all part of the School Lunch Program Budget. However, we can be assured of the continued growth of the program, thereby increasing the health benefits to our school children, if the program remains as a special fund under Sec. III of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as provided for in H.R. 5554.

Placing this program on a permanent basis, with annual authorization of \$125 million, would remove any possible reluctance to participate on the part of cooperating agencies. They would have a more definite assurance of the availability of funds and the mechanics of the programs on which to base their future plans for participation. The schools and cooperating agencies have come to appreciate the value of the special milk program and would undoubtedly be willing to encourage its expansion if it were placed on a permanent basis. We hasten to add that in future years the annual amount may have to be increased to meet the needs of our growing society. H.R. 5554 provides that increased funds can be appropriated to meet such demands, but set the minimum of \$125 million for the immediate future.

Some upward adjustment in the rate of reimbursement may become necessary in order to encourage participation in certain areas of the country. We have in mind areas that have been hard hit by economic depression, where children find it difficult or even impossible to take part in the program at present.

The Grange would like to see every boy and girl in public educational programs receive milk as a part of their daily school or day care center activities, regardless of their ability to share a portion of the program cost. If a "means test" is to be used to determine if the children of poor parents should receive this food free, then it should be required that no method be used to differentiate between these children in such a way that the recipients of free milk are made an object of scorn or ridicule.

The cost-price squeeze that dairy farmers are faced with today makes it all the more imperative that every means possible be utilized to maintain and expand our markets for dairy products, particularly fluid milk.

The health habits of children are formed at an early age; therefore we cannot stress enough the importance of the Special Milk Program. School children, through the program, now have a definite incentive and opportunity to develop proper and sound health habits through the drinking of milk, a habit that they will carry with them throughout their lives. Thus the program not only aids in improving the physical health of the Nation's children, but also provides the springboard to a stronger dairy product market in future years.

At its 99th Annual Session in November 1965, the National Grange adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved. That the National Grange encourage every appropriate government agency to purchase dairy products for school lunches, welfare recipients, and other governmental institutions, thus reducing the surplus of dairy products and aiding in stabilization of dairy farmers' income."

This remains the policy of the National Grange regarding government purchase of dairy products. Therefore, we believe that the Administration and this

Committee is properly advised to give serious consideration to this amendment to Sec. III of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to expand and make permanent the Special Milk Program.

We do not feel that we have to urge this Committee to adopt this legislation. Your concern and responsibility in this field have been amply demonstrated many times. We commend you for what you have done in the past, appreciate what you are doing today, and hope that your interest and concern for the health and nutrition of our children will continue to grow with the needs of our Nation.

We appreciate this opportunity of supporting H.R. 5554 regarding the Special Milk Program and pledge our support in working towards its final passage.

STATEMENT OF FRED J. GREINER, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, MILK INDUSTRY FOUNDATION

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Fred J. Greiner. I am Director of Public Affairs of the Milk Industry Foundation. The Foundation is a trade association representing dairy companies engaged in the processing and distribution of fresh milk and fresh milk products in all sections of the U.S. I appear before you today in general support of the special milk program and specifically urge you to consider favorably pending legislation dealing with this subject.

The special milk program should be continued and utilized as fully as possible. It should be supported financially so that funds may be made available for additional schools, institutions and camps to participate if they so desire.

We believe that the school milk program has made substantial contributions to the general nutrition of children and adolescents which otherwise would not have occurred. Generally it is the school age group of Americans who have somewhat higher requirements for protein and minerals—especially calcium—than have adults. Milk is the best known source of most of the essential nutrients for children and adolescents.

In light of the current revelation of the presence of hunger in the U.S. it should be recognized that the special milk program offers an ideal remedial measure in combating this high priority problem.

While, as indicated, much attention has focused recently on hunger in the United States, sound nutrition and good eating habits are important for all Americans. It does not necessarily mean that because certain Americans are affluent, that they are properly nourished. Malnutrition, as such, knows no barrier of wealth, or education.

The special milk program has been persuasive in the formation of good eating habits in the earlier years of life which tend to be followed in later years. Good nutrition is an important aspect of the health and vigor of all ages.

Obviously, the special milk program is, in many participating schools, an adjunct to the school lunch program. However, it is important that the special milk program retain its individual identity among the Federal nutrition programs because it can be utilized by some schools, institutions, or camps which, because of the lack of facilities or for other reasons, have not been able to institute a full school lunch program.

We, of course, would not contend that the special milk program is in any way superior to the school lunch program. The merits of the school lunch program are unquestioned. We do suggest, however, that the special milk program is a highly effective supplemental program to the school lunch program and that it contributes to the improved nutrition for large numbers of children. It is usable in locations where the school lunch program is not presently operative. It helps build better eating habits among those to whom it is available, and it contributes toward the vigor and the well-being of an important segment of our population.

While the special milk program has been instrumental in providing good nutrition and promoting better eating habits, it has also had as one of its purposes the implementation of declared policy of Congress to provide economic support for the nation's dairy farmers.

The dairy industry in the U.S. is producing more milk than can be sold through commercial channels. This has been true for the past decade, and it appears that it will be true in the years to come.

It is unnecessary to detail for this Committee the purchases of dairy products by the Federal government under the price support program. Neither must I detail the many programs that have been designed for the disposition of dairy products acquired by the Federal government. It is sufficient to say that the milk supply-demand situation clearly indicates an urgent need for the continuance of government programs of assistance to the nation's dairy industry. This includes full and permanent support of the special milk program.

Therefore, the Foundation respectfully urges this Committee to provide for a permanent special milk program where full reimbursement at established rates may be made to present participants and to those who may be anticipated to become participants during the coming fiscal year. We urge your favorable consideration of legislation to strengthen and make permanent the special milk program.

STATEMENT OF JOHN C. YORK, GENERAL MANAGER, EASTERN MILK PRODUCERS COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, INC.

My name is John C. York. I am General Manager of Eastern Milk Producers Cooperative Association, Inc., whose offices are located in Syracuse, New York. The mailing address is Kinne Road, Syracuse, New York 13214.

The Association is a milk producers bargaining cooperative with a total membership of 10,000 dairy farmers, whose farms are situated throughout the Northeast. The milk of our member-farmers is sold in numerous areas of that section of the country, and particularly in the New York-New Jersey market.

We have a direct and vital interest in the continued operation of the children's milk program, and in its continued expansion. Accordingly, we strongly support the enactment of H.R. 5554, introduced by the distinguished Chairman of this Committee. Several other members of the House of Representatives have introduced similar bills, and these all have the same objective.

The introduction of these bills has been occasioned by a sudden proposal by the Executive Branch of the Government to do away with the children's milk program. The Budget Message for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, submitted by President Johnson on January 15, 1969, proposed the termination of the milk program in its entirety. For dairy farmers this is an unexpected blow, as we are sure it must also be for the millions of children who have benefited from the program.

The Budget Message submitted last month appears to relate the proposal for terminating the milk program to a concomitant recommendation for the appropriation of more money to provide "for normal growth in school lunch program and more adequate diets for needy children, \$90 million for special assistance to needy children, \$10 million for the school breakfast program, \$10 million for food service equipment, and \$20.5 million for the non-school food program."

I want to emphasize that our Association does not object to these proposed additional expenditures, but we do object to the idea of having all this expansion done at the expense of the special milk program.

BACKGROUND OF THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

The special milk program for children originated in New York City in 1940. It was then known as the "School Milk Program" or "Penny Milk Program," since children were able to buy a half-pint of milk for one cent. That program was the first of the child nutrition programs to be operated by a Federal Agency. Other programs have since followed in its wake.

The children's milk program, as originally conceived and formulated, had a twofold purpose: (1) To aid fluid milk producers by increasing the amount of milk sold in fluid form, thereby raising farm income; and (2) to improve the nutrition of the school children.

In those days, that is, in 1940, the U.S. Department of Agriculture recognized that its first responsibility was to improve the economic welfare of farmers. The view held then was that, unless the milk program were to do that, the operation would belong to some other Agency.

Judged from its economic point of view, the children's milk program has resulted in benefits to producers, per dollar of Federal expenditure, greater than that achieved by any other nutrition program. First, the program increases sales of fluid milk. Second, were that milk not so sold, dairy farmers would receive only what it is worth for surplus by-products. The by-products would of course

then be purchased by the Federal Government as a part of its price-support program, and would be disposed of wherever possible.

In emphasizing that economic factor, we should not overlook the fact that the program has also contributed to the health of children of school age.

Once started, the children's milk program expanded only slowly, however, due to the events of the war and post-war periods. When these crisis periods were over Congress re-invigorated the program and made specific provision for it in the Agricultural Act of 1954. Congress re-emphasized the significance of Federal assistance to increasing the consumption of milk by children of school age. In the declaration of policy in that Act Congress stated: "The production and use of abundant supplies of high quality milk and dairy products are essential to the health and general welfare of the Nation."

The Agricultural Act of 1954 provided that the children's milk program be financed from funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Seven years later Congress modified the method of financing. That was done in the Agricultural Act of 1961, which provided that funds for the program should thereafter come out of regular appropriations. That Act authorized the appropriation of "such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture * * * to encourage consumption of fluid milk by children in the United States."

For the last three years the special milk program has been operated pursuant to the provisions of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, Congress appropriated a sum of \$104 million.

For a long while the U.S. Department of Agriculture showed great appreciation of the value of the special milk program and took great credit for its operation. In a publication issued in June 1965 entitled "Milk and Milk Products in the Nation's Schools" the writers said: "The marketing of increasing quantities of milk through schools has contributed to the stabilization of the fluid milk market during the past decade."

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman joined in praising the program. On June 1, 1965, on the occasion of the beginning of June 1965 as Dairy Month, Mr. Freeman said:

"The special milk program is another instance of the expanding market for milk by pricing it within the range of most children. Over three billion half-pints of milk will have been served under this program by the close of the current school year * * *. Yet, good as the school records are, they are not good enough."

THE 1966 EFFORT TO CURTAIL THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

All words of satisfaction notwithstanding, the Budget Message submitted in January 1966 recommended a reduction in the appropriation for the special milk program from \$103 million to \$21 million.

How that proposal fared is now history. There were cries of protest and anguish throughout the country. People just couldn't understand why anyone should want to hurt the program. Not only dairy farmers but also legislators, school officials, parents of school children and citizens from every walk of life joined in the protest. In the end the proposal was defeated. The continued operation of the program was authorized by Congress in the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

THE CURRENT EFFORT TO TERMINATE THE CHILDREN'S MILK PROGRAM

As already stated, the Budget Message submitted in January 1969 recommends the termination of the special milk program for children. This recommendation goes the 1966 effort one better. Then the program was to be reduced to one-fifth its size. Now it is to be eliminated altogether.

This move has engendered consternation among dairy farmers: they are perplexed and hurt. Farmers are asking why the Executive Branch of the Government is renewing its designs against the program. If the proposal lacked merit in 1966, it lacks merit now.

The attempt to curtail the milk program in 1966 was justified by Government spokesmen on the ground that surpluses of dairy products had disappeared, and that there was no further need for moving fluid milk into consumption channels through the program. Now that surpluses of dairy products are again with us, to the extent of 4.5 billion pounds of milk equivalent annually, the basis for cutting the program has been re-rationalized. The reason now given is that recommendations are being made simultaneously for other nutrition programs. This,

of course, is of little comfort to dairy farmers. It would not reduce their losses.

Accordingly, to settle this matter once and for all, Eastern strongly urges the enactment of H.R. 5554. Such action would give dairy farmers assurance that the children's milk program would be established on a permanent basis, and that it would not be tampered with in the future. Dairymen would be spared in the years to come the ordeal which they experienced in 1966 and to which they are being again subjected this year. Also, in these days when there is mounting evidence of malnutrition among many children, the milk program would furnish the most efficient means for meeting that condition.

H.R. 5554 has the additional merit of raising the annual authorization for the program to \$125 million from the current authorization of \$120 million. This increase will be needed in future years to provide for an expanding population.

THE UNECONOMIC FACTOR IN THE BUDGET MESSAGE PROPOSAL

Paradoxical as it may seem, it is very questionable whether the proposal to terminate the special milk program would save the Federal Government any money. The fact is that the subsidy money saved from the special milk program would have to be spent by the Government in buying up the same milk, in the form of surplus manufactured dairy products.

In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968, the Federal Government subsidized the sale of 3.4 billion half-pints of milk under the special milk program. The total subsidy was \$103.7 million. If the same milk were purchased by the Government in the form of manufactured dairy products the federal expenditures—everything considered—would probably be about the same.

The current support price for manufacturing milk is \$4.28 per hundredweight, but this is the price that farmers receive for the raw milk. The Government buys manufactured products, however, such as butter, skim milk powder, cheese, and evaporated milk. The price it pays necessarily includes manufacturing costs. Also, once the Government acquires the manufactured products it must store them until they are needed, it must transport them to the point of consumption, and it must repackage them in a form suitable for distribution. Manufacturing costs alone are estimated at about \$1 per hundredweight of milk.

It should be emphasized that there would be no chance of the manufactured products being sold in commercial channels, thereby relieving the Government from buying them. There are surpluses already on the market which the Government is buying under the price-support program. It is predicted that for the calendar year 1969 purchases would come to about 4.5 billion pounds of milk equivalent. Doing away with the special milk program would raise this quantity to 6.3 billion pounds.

Nor is there much chance that children would buy the milk anyhow, and would pay the full price for it. Once Federal assistance were withdrawn the program would collapse. Even with the Federal subsidy there were difficulties in getting the program underway.

LOSSES TO DAIRY FARMERS IF PROGRAM WERE TERMINATED

The termination of the special milk program for children as proposed in the Budget Message would result in an annual loss of \$45 million to dairy farmers.

The basis of this estimate is simple: The dealers' average buying price for fluid milk in the United States at the beginning of 1969 was \$6.65 per hundredweight. The average price per manufacturing milk was \$4.16 (3.5 percent butterfat basis). The difference is \$2.49. As previously indicated a total of 1.8 billion pounds of milk was contributed under the program in 1968.

From what has been said before, it is clear that the loss to dairy farmers would not benefit the Federal budget. Most, if not all, of the money now spent under the special milk program would still be spent to remove the resultant surpluses from normal channels of trade, transport, store and re-package them.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of all these considerations, Eastern Milk Producers Cooperative Association urges the Committee on Agriculture to approve H.R. 5554, and to press for its speedy enactment by Congress. Such action would avoid the damage which the Budget Message recommendation would otherwise bring about.

STATEMENT OF HARRY L. GRAHAM, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, NATIONAL
FARMER'S ORGANIZATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Harry L. Graham, Legislative Representative of the National Farmer's Organization.

It is an honor and a personal pleasure to represent the National Farmer's Organization before the Congress. I have always admired the objectives of this young, vigorous, and rapidly growing organization. We have worked together with mutual profit in the past as we have tried to reach the legislative objectives the Grange and the N.F.O. had in common.

The N.F.O. has as its primary objective the improvement of farm income by blocking together enough production to be able to bargain collectively and successfully. However, the organization is keenly aware that many factors enter into the development of effective demand. These include domestic prosperity, international trade, and governmental policy toward the purchase, storage and use of food.

We have also been aware of the need to use farm products to provide a desirable and adequate diet for all people, both here and abroad. We have supported the expansion of the original surplus food distribution programs to needy people into programs designed specifically for children.

The first of these was the school milk program. Despite the desirable growth and acceptance of the school lunch program and now the breakfast program, the milk program remains the most widely acceptable and used program of the total child feeding group.

Indeed, the milk program is the only food program available to children in many schools, including rural schools too small to have lunch programs, larger rural and village schools with inadequate facilities, and city schools in metropolitan areas such as Houston and Los Angeles.

The basic dietary deficiency of most undernourished and improperly nourished children is protein which is most readily available in milk. This is what makes milk the ideal food supplement. It is also the primary source of the bone building minerals so necessary for child growth and development.

Not many children in America are without any food. However, many have diets that are unbalanced and inadequate and the neediest families usually have diets which are heavy in carbohydrates.

The ideal situation would be to have a fully balanced meal three times a day. A desirable food program for the schools would be a balanced and nourishing lunch. However, my own children have reported to me through the years that their lunches seem to be overloaded with starches. These lunches I believe are as good or better than the average and this situation has been repeated in three different school systems in three different states.

There seems to be no reason to now abandon and discard all of the lessons we have learned during the past several years and disregard our substantial experience which has proven the value of the school milk program, even though the surplus supply of milk is no longer a pressing farm economic problem. A glass of milk in mid-morning, another at noon, and if possible another during the afternoon provides highly desirable and necessary food needs in acceptable form as well as the energy source so badly needed by high energy consuming small children.

The school milk program has earned our support, not as a surplus disposal program, but as a vital and worthwhile supplemental food program essential to the physical and mental growth of children. Even if there was a shortage of milk for the general public, the N.F.O. would support its extension and oppose efforts to destroy its identity and hamper its usefulness as it serves the vital needs of our Nation's school children.

We are therefore grateful to the distinguished chairman of this committee for his introduction of H.R. 5554 to extend this authorization for another year. We support this legislation.

We would also point out that the N.F.O. supports the long-term authorization for all food programs. We do not believe that the best interest of our children, needy adults, and the health and welfare of the Nation is best served by placing the programs in jeopardy by an annual wrangle over these programs, whether in the executive or legislative branches of the government.

Therefore, if it would please the Committee, we would be happy to support before the Congress the additional automatic authorization of \$130 million in fiscal 1970-71, and an annual authorization of \$135 million thereafter as provided in H.R. 5568 introduced by Mr. Sisk.

This popular program would still be subject to periodic review at the discretion of this distinguished Committee, and subject to such changes and improvements as the Committee should recommend and the Congress approve. We do not foresee the time when improvements or modifications would not be needed.

However, we can see signs on the horizon that the expertise developed by the experience of this Committee would be lost to the Nation if the desires expressed by some elected and appointed government officials were fulfilled and this and related food programs were removed from the Department of Agriculture and therefore from the jurisdiction of this Committee. The Nation's Agriculture which you and the N.F.O. seek to serve would not be well served by this development.

We therefore seriously and respectfully urge that you consider the enactment of H.R. 5568. However, if you, in your wisdom, should report out H.R. 5554, the N.F.O. will support your decision and we shall return next year to again help to extend this important legislation. The commitment of the N.F.O. is not to specific pieces of legislation but to the welfare of American Agriculture and thus to the welfare of our Nation and all its people.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. If there are no further questions the committee will now stand adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 10:30 a.m., the committee adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.)



LEGISLATIVE HISTORY
Public Law 91-295
H. R. 5554

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Index and summary of H. R. 5554.....	1
---	---

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 5554

Jan. 30, 1969 Rep. Poage introduced H. R. 5554 which was referred to House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as introduced.

Mar. 20, 1969 House committee reported H. R. 5554 without amendment H. Rept. 91-110. Print of bill and report.

Mar. 25, 1969 The Rules Committee postponed action.

Apr. 29, 1969 The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 5554.

May 6, 1969 House passed H. R. 5554 with amendment.

May 8, 1969 H. R. 5554 was referred to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as referred.

May 6, 1970 Senate committee reported H. R. 5554 with amendment. S. Rept. 91-842. Print of bill and report.

May 11, 1970 Senate passed H. R. 5554 with amendment.

June 16, 1970 House agreed to Senate amendment.

June 30, 1970 H. R. 5554 became public law without the President's signature. P. L. 91-295.

Copy of President's statement when declining to sign H. R. 5554

Hearing: House Agriculture Committee hearing on H. R. 5554 and other bills. Serial A Feb. 18 and March 11, 1969.

Jan
30,
1969

Mar.
10,
Mar
20
1969
1969

Mar
25,
1969

PUR
April
29,
1969

W 305

May
6
1969/10
June
9
1970

May
8
1969/0

May
9
1970
1970

Apr.
May
11
1970-2.3

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5554

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 30, 1969

MR. POAGE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To provide a special milk program for children.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended
4 to read as follows:

5 “SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated
6 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for each suc-
7 ceeding fiscal year, not to exceed \$125,000,000, to enable
8 the Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules and regulations
9 as he may deem in the public interest, to encourage con-
10 sumption of fluid milk by children in the United States in
11 (1) nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, and

1 (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement
2 houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions
3 devoted to the care and training of children. For the purposes
4 of this section 'United States' means the fifty States and
5 the District of Columbia. The Secretary shall administer the
6 special milk program provided for by this section to the
7 maximum extent practicable in the same manner as he ad-
8 ministered the special milk program provided for by Public
9 Law 89-642, as amended, during the fiscal year ending
10 June 30, 1969."

1222 H. 11. 2024

A BILL

To provide a special milk program for children.

By Mr. Poage

JANUARY 30, 1969

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued March 21, 1969
For actions of March 20, 1969
91st-1st; No. 49

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	11,36	Forest lands.....	17	Pollution.....	4,40,43,64
Aging.....	15	Forestry.....	7,29	Poverty.....	32,58
Appalachian Regional Commission.....	16	Free trade.....	46	Product safety.....	49
Arbor Day.....	77	Grains.....	26	Reclamation.....	13
Buildings.....	21	Health.....	25,62	Recreation.....	61
CCC.....	16	Hogs.....	41	Research.....	9,14,29,54,73
Census.....	8,39,69	Honey imports.....	75	Retirement.....	48,53,59
Child nutrition.....	1	Housing.....	29,67	Rural development.....	28
Claims.....	19	Hunger.....	37	Rural mail.....	74
Committee assignments.....	5	Imported food.....	34	Rural telephones.....	68
Conservation.....	18,42	Interest rates.....	24	Saline water.....	14
Consumers.....	38	Legislative program.....	10	Salaries.....	71
Cooperatives.....	28	Loans.....	68	School lunches.....	1
Department of Peace.....	33	Lumber prices.....	7,47	Screw worm.....	9
Education.....	6,58	Lumber standards.....	31	Small business.....	27
Electrification.....	28,68	Marine sanctuaries.....	50	Special milk.....	2,10
Farm labor.....	22	Meat inspection.....	51	Storm warnings.....	73
Federal aid.....	23,30,67	Milk.....	2,35,63	Supergrades.....	20
Firefighters.....	55	Mink imports.....	56	Tariff.....	56,75
Food inspection.....	34	Nominations.....	16	Taxation.....	30,64,76
Food stamp.....	44,52	Non-farm income.....	30,64	Transportation.....	46
Foreign affairs.....	65	Organization.....	66,70	Travel.....	3,10
Foreign aid.....	45	Personnel.....		Water resources.....	54
Foreign trade.....	34,46,56,75	3,20,48,53,57,59,60,62,71		Wilderness.....	12
		Pesticides.....	40	Wildlife.....	72

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bill to provide free and reduced-price meals for needy children. House committee reported bill to make special milk program permanent. House committee reported bill to increase per diem travel allowance. Senate committee reported Desolation Wilderness bill. Senate confirmed Paarlberg nomination to CCC Board of Directors.

HOUSE

1. CHILD NUTRITION. Passed with amendments H. R. 515, to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (pp. H1950-63). The committee report summarizes the bill as follows: "The bill amplifies present language... of the National School Lunch Act which requires meals to be served without cost or at a reduced cost to children unable to pay the full cost of the lunch. The bill requires that such children be determined by a systematic plan applied to all families on the basis of need criteria...Under the bill, State appropriated funds for the school lunch program made up from tax sources must equal at least 4 percent of the matching requirements. Every other fiscal year thereafter the State revenue matching requirement would be increased by 2 percent until the State matching requirements reached a level of 10 percent...authorizes nutrition training in education...would amend appropriations authorizations of the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act to permit not to exceed 1 percent of the funds to be used for grants to States in providing nutritional training and education for program participants and employees...would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to take a hard look at some of the competition to the balanced meal offered within schools and service institutions" and "provides flexibility to the Department and to the States as they move toward providing a fully adequate food service for children."
Agreed to amendments by Rep. Steiger to (1) force State revenue to be used proportionately between regular school lunch programs and special school lunch programs and (2) require cooperation and coordination between USDA and HEW in the development of nutrition education and training in schools and evaluation of the effectiveness of food programs for children (pp. H1961-3).
2. SPECIAL MILK. The Agriculture Committee reported H. R. 5554, to make the special milk program for children permanent (H. Rept. 91-110). p. H1990
3. TRAVEL. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 337, to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business (H. Rept. 91-111). p. H1990
4. POLLUTION. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 4148, the proposed Water Quality Improvement Act. p. D209
5. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Accepted the resignation of Rep. Corbett as a member of the House Administration Committee and elected Rep. Hansen, Idaho, as a member of this committee. p. H1950
6. EDUCATION. Rep. Perkins inserted excerpts from testimonies evaluating the effectiveness of elementary and secondary education legislation. pp. H1968-72
7. LUMBER PRICES. Rep. Wyatt stated the reason behind the building material price increase, "particularly as it applies to lumber and plywood products, can be linked to the very basic functions of supply and demand" and suggested the introduction of "high intensity forest management...involving precommercial and commercial thinnings--reforestation with super trees, genetics, and fertilization--using every known method of making trees grow more rapidly." pp. H1974-6
8. CENSUS. Rep. Charles H. Wilson stated that as chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics he intends to undertake a complete examination of the "controversial census question issue." p. H1979

EXTENSION OF CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

MARCH 20, 1969.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. POAGE, from the Committee on Agriculture,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 5554]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 5554) for extension of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

This bill would extend indefinitely the special milk program authorization contained in section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. Additionally, it would increase the appropriation authorization for the fiscal year 1970 and ensuing years by \$5 million—from \$120 million to \$125 million.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

Section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 contains appropriation authorization through fiscal 1970. Those responsible for programing expenditures in educational institutions which currently participate in the special milk program have indicated that early action on the appropriation authorization is required to insure adequate budgetary consideration.

The special milk program is one of but a few governmental programs currently in existence which are able to reach such a wide segment of our population—nearly 10 percent of our entire population and one-third of our schoolchildren.

HEARINGS

Hearings were held by the committee on February 18 and March 11, 1969, on H.R. 5554, H.R. 6641, H.R. 7077, and H.R. 7961. H.R. 5568, H.R. 6056, H.R. 6530, H.R. 6532, and H.R. 7612 are similar to H.R. 5554, except for the fact that they would authorize larger sums for operation of the special milk program. Testimony given at the hearings overwhelmingly supported these measures. The committee unanimously approved H.R. 5554.

DEPARTMENTAL POSITION

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Richard E. Lyng testified at the hearing that: "The administration has not had an opportunity to assess this legislation (H.R. 5554) in relation to the 1970 budget for the child nutrition programs as a whole * * * ."; however, he did indicate that it is an objective of the Department " * * * to make available subsidized milk until such time as the school provides full lunch facilities."

COST

The bill simply increases the maximum appropriation authority for the fiscal year 1970 and ensuing years from \$120 to \$125 million—an increase of \$5 million.

BACKGROUND

Since 1954, the Department of Agriculture has operated a special milk program designed to encourage increased milk consumption by children. The program also helps maintain a healthy fluid milk dairy economy by expanding the market for fluid milk.

From fiscal year 1955 through fiscal year 1962, the program was financed through advances from Commodity Credit Corporation funds. The Agricultural Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-128), approved August 8, 1961, authorized an appropriation for the program and extended it through June 30, 1967. The Child Nutrition Act of 1966 incorporated the special milk program and extended it through fiscal year 1970.

In 1954, only nonprofit schools of high school grade and under were eligible for participation in the program; since that time, the program has been expanded to include nonprofit child care institutions such as nursery schools, summer camps, and settlement houses. Generally speaking, any institution which has been declared tax exempt by the Internal Revenue Service is eligible for the program.

Nationally, the special milk program is administered by the School Lunch Division, Consumer and Marketing Service, of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, under provisions of section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. Locally, the program is administered in all public schools within a State by the State educational agency. In many States, this same agency also administers the program in nonprofit private schools and child care institutions. A number of States are prohibited by State statutes from administering the program in eligible nonprofit private schools and institutions. In such States the Consumer and Marketing Service administers the program directly through agreements with these schools and institutions. The Con-

sumer and Marketing Service also administers the program in outlets for which no State agency has assumed administrative responsibility.

Through fiscal year 1967, based upon available funds and prior year participation, letters of credit were issued to each State agency authorizing funds for the first half of the year. These letters were later revised to authorize additional funds as needed for the remainder of the year. In order to keep expenditures within the amounts available, reimbursements to participating outlets were discounted through January 31, 1967.

Beginning in fiscal year 1968, available funds were apportioned among the States on the basis of payments made to schools and child care institutions for program reimbursement during the preceding year. Each State agency is advised of the amount of funds available to it for program reimbursement during the entire fiscal year.

The letter of credit procedure, established in 1965, permits State agencies to obtain funds to pay claims on hand by filing appropriate documents, through normal banking channels, with the Federal Reserve banks. This assures that funds will be available to the States for prompt payment of claims, and insures that Federal funds will be withdrawn from the Treasury only as needed by the States for payment of claims. No Federal funds are used by the State agencies for administering this program in the States.

From fiscal years 1955 to 1968, the number of outlets participating in the program has more than doubled and the number of half pints served has increased more than six times.

During the first year of program operation, 41,094 schools served approximately 449.8 million half pints of milk.

In fiscal 1968, 94,422 schools and child care institutions served an estimated 2,987.5 million half pints of milk. Of these, 88,042 were schools and 6,380 child care institutions.

PROGRAM STATISTICS BY FISCAL YEARS

Fiscal year	Number of outlets participating	Half pints reimbursed (millions)	Number of children participating (million) ¹	Total reimbursement payments
1955.....	41,094	449.8	2.5	\$17,220,281
1956.....	62,266	1,394.2	7.7	45,842,194
1957.....	71,239	1,752.7	9.7	60,411,200
1958.....	76,478	1,918.2	10.7	66,290,970
1959.....	81,587	2,176.2	12.1	74,223,939
1960.....	83,922	2,384.7	13.2	80,277,086
1961.....	86,494	2,476.7	13.8	84,008,164
1962.....	88,188	2,631.0	14.6	88,713,265
1963.....	90,486	2,765.6	15.4	93,347,465
1964.....	91,890	2,929.0	16.3	99,156,543
1965.....	92,005	2,966.8	16.5	97,268,651
1966.....	97,437	3,059.1	17.0	96,025,736
1967.....	95,139	3,027.2	17.0	98,782,412
1968.....	94,422	2,987.5	17.0	102,451,178
1969 (estimated).....	94,500	3,000.0	-----	103,314,000

¹ Estimated on basis of 180 school days per year.

Your committee does not believe it is necessary to reiterate in this report the scientific facts regarding the benefits to child nutrition which accrue from the increased use of fluid milk. The recent findings of this committee and other investigating committees of Congress fully document the need for increased use of our food abundance to

provide the minimum daily requirements of essential nutrients to our schoolchildren. Nutritionists have long contended that children of school age need a minimum of 1 quart of milk per day to insure sufficient calcium intake. Available statistics clearly demonstrate that these needs are not fulfilled especially with respect to children of low-income areas. The special milk program has made good inroads toward correcting this deficiency. As early as 1960 a study conducted by the Department of Agriculture revealed that:

The effect of the special milk program on consumption was especially pronounced in low-income areas. In these low-income areas per capita intake of whole milk during the survey period averaged nearly 4 ounces more for children attending special milk program schools than for those attending other schools. The 4-ounce average represented rural and urban areas combined; the difference between low-income urban schools under the special milk program and those not under the program was even larger. The impact of the special milk program was smaller in schools serving medium-income areas. Children in high-income areas drank milk at about the same rate whether or not their schools participated in the special milk program. Also, children from high-income areas attending special milk program schools drank nearly one-fifth again as much milk, and those attending other schools drank almost half again as much as children from low-income areas.

Progress continues to be made under the special milk program—since 1960 the number of students served has increased by one-third, from 13 to 17 million, and the number of participating outlets has been increased by nearly 15 percent.

The above conclusions are further strengthened by the fact that, in many instances, the only whole fluid milk which many of our school-age children receive is through the special milk program.

The special milk program has had the dual effect of encouraging increased consumption of milk by 17 million children as a nutritional measure and reducing purchases of dairy products by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Historically, dairy commodity programs under CCC have diverted between 4 and 5 percent of the Nation's milk production, and it therefore follows that eliminating the appropriation necessary for continuation of the special milk program in the interest of economy is a specious contention.

No imported milk or milk products are utilized in this program.

The volume of milk consumed under the program in 1968 amounted to more than 3 percent of the total nonfarm consumption of fluid milk. This was in addition to more than 3.1 billion half pints used in national school lunch program type A lunches; i.e., lunches which include a serving of milk and which meet certain other nutritional requirements.

Each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia are currently participating in the program. The following table reports by State the number of outlets participating, number of half pints reimbursed, and obligations for 1967 and 1968:

State	Number of outlets participating		Estimated number of half pints of milk reimbursed (millions)		Obligations (thousands)	
	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968
Alabama.....	1,625	1,552	47.8	44.6	\$1,552	\$1,650
Alaska.....	79	87	1.4	1.4	35	31
Arizona.....	636	675	16.2	15.6	481	463
Arkansas.....	1,078	1,031	30.6	28.7	1,122	1,106
California.....	7,794	8,026	291.4	291.8	8,881	9,296
Colorado.....	1,238	1,204	28.1	26.9	912	961
Connecticut.....	1,330	1,394	54.1	55.6	1,608	1,720
Delaware.....	229	242	10.5	10.8	355	366
District of Columbia.....	235	233	25.8	21.7	903	570
Florida.....	1,810	1,788	66.1	66.6	1,877	1,992
Georgia.....	1,712	1,693	40.4	37.9	1,608	1,596
Hawaii.....	263	274	6.8	5.6	236	199
Idaho.....	601	590	6.0	7.0	190	202
Illinois.....	4,690	4,854	204.5	200.7	6,390	6,632
Indiana.....	2,483	2,593	78.9	82.1	2,713	2,939
Iowa.....	2,239	2,185	52.3	49.4	1,849	1,854
Kansas.....	1,895	1,857	35.1	33.7	1,153	1,167
Kentucky.....	1,523	1,309	47.5	41.2	1,765	1,831
Louisiana.....	1,242	1,319	19.0	18.7	681	689
Maine.....	902	955	15.6	15.8	515	508
Maryland.....	1,450	1,468	64.9	62.2	2,190	2,259
Massachusetts.....	3,028	2,994	109.5	111.2	3,488	3,585
Michigan.....	4,602	4,462	167.7	168.0	5,446	5,801
Minnesota.....	2,723	2,517	77.4	73.2	2,665	2,695
Mississippi.....	1,074	1,058	34.6	36.9	1,274	1,355
Missouri.....	2,892	2,897	62.0	62.3	2,203	2,311
Montana.....	460	429	6.2	6.3	196	205
Nebraska.....	1,011	998	18.3	17.9	625	645
Nevada.....	222	221	5.1	5.5	139	152
New Hampshire.....	546	559	14.5	15.6	477	511
New Jersey.....	2,520	2,622	113.4	120.6	3,735	3,984
New Mexico.....	702	713	28.7	28.5	742	773
New York.....	6,372	6,369	276.3	268.5	9,472	9,670
North Carolina.....	1,812	1,786	73.1	81.2	2,926	3,465
North Dakota.....	548	535	10.9	11.2	371	393
Ohio.....	5,493	5,170	206.2	200.2	6,396	6,574
Oklahoma.....	1,472	1,521	33.7	33.2	1,048	1,053
Oregon.....	1,353	1,342	21.2	21.7	571	647
Pennsylvania.....	6,049	5,829	163.9	158.7	4,920	5,233
Rhode Island.....	407	370	14.4	15.4	469	425
South Carolina.....	1,215	1,225	21.6	18.2	740	633
South Dakota.....	502	511	12.5	11.4	374	367
Tennessee.....	1,991	1,972	54.6	52.1	1,777	1,832
Texas.....	3,907	3,426	116.2	107.9	3,700	3,732
Utah.....	581	591	10.2	10.1	349	359
Vermont.....	435	421	7.0	7.4	226	253
Virginia.....	1,794	1,801	53.6	54.8	1,726	1,828
Washington.....	1,805	1,811	43.9	44.8	1,443	1,507
West Virginia.....	978	1,205	18.2	17.0	585	665
Wisconsin.....	3,348	3,526	105.8	106.2	3,558	3,648
Wyoming.....	243	212	3.5	3.5	125	119
Total.....	95,139	94,422	3,027.2	2,987.5	98,782	102,451

SUMMARY

Under H.R. 5554, the special milk program contained in section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 would become permanent and there would be an appropriation authorization increase of \$5 million—from \$120 to \$125 million.

Operation of the program would not be altered in any way.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in *italic*, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in *roman*):

CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

* * * * *

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending **June 30, 1967**, not to exceed \$110,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, not to exceed \$115,000,000; and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years not to exceed \$120,000,000 *June 30, 1970, and for each succeeding fiscal year, not to exceed \$125,000,000* to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules and regulations as he may deem in the public interest, to encourage consumption of fluid milk by children in the United States in (1) non-profit schools of high school grade and under, and (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. For the purposes of this section "United States" means the fifty States and the District of Columbia. The Secretary shall administer the special milk program provided for by this section to the maximum extent practicable in the same manner as he administered the special milk program provided for by Public Law **[85-478]** 89-642, as amended, during the fiscal year ended June 30, **[1966]** 1969.

* * * * *

○



91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5554

[Report No. 91-110]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 30, 1969

Mr. POAGE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

MARCH 20, 1969

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union
and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To provide a special milk program for children.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended
4 to read as follows:

5 “SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated
6 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for each suc-
7 ceeding fiscal year, not to exceed \$125,000,000, to enable
8 the Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules and regulations
9 as he may deem in the public interest, to encourage con-
10 sumption of fluid milk by children in the United States in
11 (1) nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, and

1 (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement
2 houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions
3 devoted to the care and training of children. For the purposes
4 of this section 'United States' means the fifty States and
5 the District of Columbia. The Secretary shall administer the
6 special milk program provided for by this section to the
7 maximum extent practicable in the same manner as he ad-
8 ministered the special milk program provided for by Public
9 Law 89-642, as amended, during the fiscal year ending
10 June 30, 1969."

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

OF THE

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT

CHICAGO, ILL.

1954

H. R. 2224

1954

A BILL

To provide a special milk program for children.

By Mr. POAGE

JANUARY 30, 1969

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

MARCH 20, 1969

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued March 26, 1969
For actions of March 25, 1969
91st-1st; No. 51

CONTENTS

Appalachia.....	15,31	Forest lands.....	36	Ocean research.....	42
Appropriations.....	1	Grapefruit.....	12	Personnel.....	3,23
Bonds.....	34	Health.....	44	Pollution.....	2,44
CCC.....	1	Health benefits.....	23	Public works moratorium..	5
Census.....	38	Highways.....	24	Purchasing.....	33
Child nutrition.....	4,18	Housing.....	8	Reclamation.....	40
Cigarette advertising.....	11,16	Information.....	14,38,39	Recreation.....	21
Consumer protection.....	10	Inspection service.....	26	Reorganization.....	19
Debt ceiling.....	17,45	Interest rates.....	7,34	Retirement.....	23
Electrification.....	30	Labeling.....	27	Taxation.....	6,24
FHA loans.....	20,43	Lands.....	29,35,36	Tobacco.....	11,16
Farm loans.....	20,43	Legislative program.....	13	Travel.....	3
Farm program.....	41	Libraries.....	39	U.S.-Mexico.....	32
Fisheries.....	28	Lumber prices.....	22	Water.....	35,40
Foreign affairs.....	32	Meat imports.....	25	Watersheds.....	9
Foreign trade.....	25,37	Milk.....	4		
		Mink imports.....	37		

HIGHLIGHTS: See page 6.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 584. Rep. Mahon stated "this is a joint resolution advancing from fiscal year 1970 into fiscal year 1969 the sum of \$1 billion for the purpose of restoring impaired capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Due to heavy unexpected production of certain of the major crops, the Commodity Credit Coporation has on hand about \$5 billion worth of commodities. As a result of this and other factors it is substantially out of cash to carry on its operations." pp..H2022-7

2. POLLUTION. The Public Works Committee reported with amendment H.R. 4148, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (H. Rept. 91-127). p. H2217.
3. TRAVEL. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H.R. 337, to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business (H. Rept. 91-129). p. H2217.
4. MILK. The "Daily Digest" states that the Rules Committee postponed action on H.R. 5554, to make the special milk program for children permanent. pp. D223-4.
5. PUBLIC WORKS MORATORIUM. Rep. Jones, Ala., expressed concern that "the administration is seriously considering a moratorium on public works" which he stated would have an adverse effect on the employment and the economy of every State in this Union." p. H2027.
6. TAX REFORM. Rep. Podell spoke in support of reforming the tax system. p. H2028.
7. INTEREST RATES. Rep. Patman inserted an article, "Impact of High Interest Rates Falls on Low-Income Group." p. H2214.
8. HOUSING. Rep. Patman inserted resolutions recommended by the Legislative Policy Committee and approved by the Board of Directors of the National Housing Conference. pp. H2195-214.
9. WATERSHEDS. Rep. Edwards, Calif., urged the President to "release the funds" for watershed projects. p. H2188.
10. CONSUMER PROTECTION. Rep. Fascell inserted his letter to the Attorney General requesting his advice on the staffing and functions which he plans to assign to the Office of Consumer Counsel within the Justice Department. p. H2176.
11. CIGARETTE ADVERTISING. Rep. Talcott objected to FCC's proposed banning of all cigarette advertising on radio and television. pp. H2169-70.
12. GRAPEFRUIT. Rep. de la Garza recommended Texas Ruby Red grapefruit to weight watchers and inserted the TexaSweat Citrus Advertising, Inc., Magic Menu. p. H2028.
13. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that on Wed. the House will consider the per diem travel allowance bill. p. D222.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

14. INFORMATION. Rep. Bray praised as a smart move the Federal Government's request for help by experienced businessmen, and inserted the text of a handbook, "Pointers On Preparing an Employee Handbook." pp. E2360-2.
15. APPALACHIA. Rep. Fulton, Pa., inserted Pa. Gov. Shafer's testimony in support of extension of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. pp. E2365-7.

15. HUNGER. Sen. McGovern inserted an article, "A Young Mother's Story--Hunger Next Door." pp. S4274-5.
16. TRAILS. Sen. Nelson inserted an article, "Trails Act Inspired by Success of Appalachian Trail Conference." pp. S4281-2.
17. PESTICIDES. Sen. Nelson inserted a report on pesticides misuse (pp. S4303-6) and an article, "Wisconsin Is Site of Next Round in Fight to Ban DDT" (p. S4286).
18. ADJOURNED until Thurs., May 1. p. S4340.

HOUSE

19. SPECIAL MILK. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H.R. 5554, to provide a special milk program for children. p. H3214.
20. RETIREMENT. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H.R. 9825, to improve the financing and funding practices of the civil service retirement system, and the benefits structure relative to computation of retirement annuities, crediting of unused sick leave, etc. p. H3214.
21. SALINE WATER. Received from Interior a report regarding the progress and results obtained by the U.S. from participation in the desalting and electric power generating project off the coast of southern Calif., pursuant to Public Law 90-16; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
22. POLLUTION. Rep. Philbin called for a massive, coordinated attack upon conditions contributing to the pollution of the Hashua River and urged its inclusion in the model river demonstration program. pp. H3209-10.
23. JOB CORPS. Rep. Podell called the elimination of 59 of the Nation's Job Corps centers an "unparalleled tragedy and another log heaved onto a smoldering pile of social problems." p. H3185.
24. CENSUS. Rep. Fuqua inserted a university professor's article explaining the purposes of the census questionnaires and how interdependence is a fact of life today, and that answering a few personal questions is a small price to pay for better functioning of our institutions. pp. H3181-3.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

25. JOB CORPS. Sen. Church and several Representatives objected to the proposed closing of certain Job Corps centers and inserted articles on this subject. pp. E3452-3, E3470, E3473-4, E3474-5.
26. POLLUTION; GARBAGE DISPOSAL. Rep. Jones, Ala., inserted an article, "Garbage Disposal--A Growing Rural Problem." pp. E3455-6.
Rep. Hungate inserted an article on the problem of water pollution. p. E3487.

27. FARM LABOR. Rep. Tunney asked for favorable consideration of proposed legislation to extend the coverage of the National Labor Relations Act to Farmworkers. p. E3467.
28. POSTAL RATES. Rep. Lukens expressed support for the President's proposal to increase postal rates. p. E3467.
29. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Schwengel inserted an article analyzing the Farm Bureau's proposed new farm program. pp. E3471-2.
30. CENSUS. Rep. Quie stated that certain census questions are necessary in estimating and planning programs, and urged his constituents to cooperate by filling out accurately and returning promptly their questionnaires. p. E3472.
31. FORESTRY. Rep. Don Fuqua inserted an address and a Fla. Legislature resolution acknowledging the importance of the "silver anniversary" cooperative field forestry program sponsored by the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad. pp. E3480-3.

BILLS INTRODUCED

32. LIBRARIES. H.R. 10666 by Rep. Brademas and H.R. 10667 by Rep. Podell, to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science; to Education and Labor Committee.
33. JOB CORPS. H.Res. 381 by Rep. Ryan with remarks of author on pp. H3189-90, H.Res. 382 by Rep. Ryan and H.R. 383 by Rep. Ryan, to express the sense of the House regarding the shutdown of Job Corps installations before congressional authorization and appropriation actions; to Education and Labor Committee
34. CONTRACTS. S. 2007 by Sen. Proxmire, to amend chapter 137, title 10, U.S.C., to limit, and to provide more effective control over, the use of Government production equipment by private contractors under contracts entered into by the Department of Defense and certain other agencies; to Armed Services Committee. Remarks of author pp. S4212-3.
H.R. 10673 by Rep. Fraser, to promote health and safety in the building trades and construction industry in all Federal and federally financed or federally assisted construction projects; to Education and Labor Committee.
35. TAXATION. H.R. 10669 by Rep. Dingell, to amend the Internal Revenue Code, of 1954 to terminate the investment credit for all property except water pollution control facilities and air pollution control facilities; to Ways and Means Committee.
H.R. 10681 by Rep. Lukens, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to Ways and Means Committee.

PUBLIC LAW 305

May
6
1969

May
8
1969

May
6
1970

May
11
1970

June
10
1971

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 7, 1969
For actions of May 6, 1969
91st-1st No. 73

CONTENTS

Aging.....9	Food message.....10	Personnel.....3,11,12
Appalachia.....22	Food stamps.....25	Population.....13
Claims'.....3	Freight rates.....26	Public works.....24
Conservation.....2	Hunger.....13	Reclamation.....19
Consumer protection.....7	Imports.....27	Rural housing.....8
Farm products.....26	Import quotas.....17	Safety.....18
Federal aid.....4,23	Intergovernmental relations.....11	Special milk program,1,16
Foreign aid.....12	Job corps.....6	Timber.....15,20
Foreign trade.....17,27	Peace corps.....14	Transportation.....5
Forests.....15,20		Wildlife.....21

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed special milk bill. House committee voted to report Great Plains conservation bill. Senate subcommittee voted to report proposed Intergovernmental Personnel Act bill. Reps. Brown and Dwyer favored proposed grant consolidation bill.

HOUSE

1. SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM. Passed, 384-2, with amendment H. R. 5554, to increase and make permanent the appropriation authorization for a special milk program for children (pp. H3386-99). Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Matsunaga to include Guam in the program (p. H3397). Rejected, 8-85, an amendment by Rep. Findley to use the resources of this program as a nutritional aid to needy children (pp. H3397-8). Rejected an amendment by Rep. Farbstein that stressed priority to needy children (p. H3398). A motion to recommit was rejected (p. H3398).
2. CONSERVATION. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 10595, to extend and amend the Great Plains conservation program. p. D353.
3. PERSONNEL; CLAIMS. The Judiciary Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 4246, to discontinue the annual report to Congress on administrative settlement of personal property claims of military personnel and civilian employees. p. D354.
4. FEDERAL AID. Rep. Brown asked enactment of the President's proposal to consolidate grant programs. p. H3406.
5. TRANSPORTATION. Rep. Flood inserted a listing of his addresses, remarks, and statements dealing with the interoceanic canal. H3411-4.
6. JOB CORPS. Rep. Olsen inserted the testimony of the executive director of the National Congress of American Indians before the House Education and Labor Committee opposing closing of several Job Corps centers. pp. H3418-22.
7. CONSUMER PROTECTION. Rep. Patman inserted a report from the Committee on Legislation, Federal Bar Council, on recommendations concerning the Government's efforts in the field of consumer protection. pp. H3430-1.
8. RURAL HOUSING. Rep. Patman discussed and urged continuation of the Farmers Home Administration's insured home loan program. pp. H3431-2.
9. AGING. Received from HEW a proposed bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to extend its duration to authorize assistance for projects for foster grandparents and senior companions, to provide assistance to strengthen State agencies on aging, and to otherwise strengthen and improve that Act; to Education and Labor Committee. p. H3438.
10. FOOD MESSAGE. It is understood that the President's food message was submitted but was not formally received or printed in the Congressional Record.

tices," and Wolfson's highly interesting and reported claim that he turned down high-level offers of political assistance that would have kept him out of a Federal prison.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE ON THE GROWING PROBLEM OF OBSCENITY THROUGH THE MAIL

(Mr. RAILSBACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Nixon, in a message to Congress, proposed a three-pronged attack to alleviate a growing problem of major national concern. The problem is obscenity and the mail and its deleterious effect upon the youth of America. J. Edgar Hoover has commented:

It is impossible to estimate the amount of harm to impressionable teenagers and to assess the volume of sex crimes attributable to pornography, but its influence is extensive.

It has, of late, grown to such proportions that it can no longer be ignored and in this regard President Nixon's proposals are extremely timely.

The major problem concerning obscene matter and the mail is the fact that almost all of the pornographic mail traffic is unsolicited, unwanted and offensive to those who receive it. Furthermore, it is almost impossible for a citizen to stem this unwarranted invasion and prevent the repeated intrusion into his home of this obscene objectionable matter. Existing legislative provisions provide no effective method for a concerned parent to protect his home from being continuously bombarded with sex-oriented material.

By such an intrusion into the home, the purveyors of obscenity create an effective opportunity for minors to come in contact with this objectionable matter. Minors, who but for this unwarranted intrusion, would not have come in contact with this material, are, in effect, pandered in their own homes.

Mr. Speaker, no person or organization should be so allowed to impose this corrupting influence upon an objecting household and family.

The legislative proposals contained in the President's message to Congress represent a major initial step toward the protection of our youth from obscene materials coming through the mail by reinforcing a man's right to privacy in his own home. The problem is real and Congress must accept its responsibility to enact legislation designed to alleviate it.

REREFERENCE OF H.R. 393 AND H.R. 3682 TO COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be discharged from the further consideration of the bills (H.R. 393 and H.R. 3682) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as wilderness the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo

National Forests, in Montana, and for other purposes, and that those bills be rereferred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

JOHN FISCHETTI AWARDED PULITZER PRIZE FOR 1969

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the very welcome news reached us late today that John Fischetti, editorial cartoonist of the Chicago Daily News, has been awarded the Pulitzer Prize for 1969 for excellence in editorial cartoons.

This is a richly deserved honor which has been bestowed on Mr. Fischetti, for he has brought to the world of editorial cartooning a new style and technique.

While the Pulitzer Prize Committee awarded this highly coveted honor on Mr. Fischetti for the "body of his work," with no particular cartoon selected, I would have singled out Mr. Fischetti's excellent portrayal of the military-industrial complex in a cartoon on April 7 which showed retired military brass on the payroll of defense contractors. The caption on this timely cartoon was: "Old soldiers never die; they just fade into defense plants."

The ability of a great cartoonist to pierce the balloons of pretense and make us laugh in common understanding at human failings and at our imperfect institutions is one of the most redeeming features of our civilization. With a few artful strokes of his pen and a succinct caption, the editorial cartoonist makes all our lives richer and more rewarding. John Fischetti is one of the great cartoonists and he well deserves this outstanding distinction.

I believe the Chicago Daily News, one of America's foremost newspapers, should also be commended for its historic excellence in recruiting an editorial staff which has consistently won Pulitzer Prizes and the tributes of the journalism profession. The Chicago Daily News has encouraged men like John Fischetti to develop to their fullest potential. I congratulate Mr. Fischetti and the Daily News for this Pulitzer Prize and wish them continued partnership for the future.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MUTUAL BENEFIT FOUNDATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2214) for the relief of the Mutual Benefit Foundation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

FRANK KLEINERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3877) for the relief of Frank Kleinerman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

PEDRO IRIZARRY GUIDO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5000) for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

REDDICK B. STILL, JR., AND RICHARD CARPENTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6400) for the relief of Reddick B. Still, Jr., and Richard Carpenter.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

NOEL S. MARSTON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6378) for the relief of Noel S. Marston.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

JOHN VINCENT AMIRAULT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2552) for the relief of John Vincent Amiraault.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

PAGONA ANOMERIANAKI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5133) for the relief of Pagona Anomerianaki.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5133

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pagona Anomerianaki may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon the approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Olga and George Staats, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pagona Anomerianaki shall be held

and considered to be the natural-born alien daughter of Olga and George Staats, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington makes the point of order that a quorum is not present, and evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 54]

Abernethy	Edwards, Calif.	Morton
Alexander	Foley	Murphy, N.Y.
Anderson,	Ford,	O'Hara
Tenn.	William D.	Ottlinger
Ashley	Fulton, Pa.	Passman
Baring	Fulton, Tenn.	Pepper
Bates	Gallagher	Pettis
Bell, Calif.	Glaime	Podell
Blackburn	Gray	Pollock
Blatnik	Grover	Powell
Boland	Hansen, Idaho	Ronan
Bow	Harvey	Rumsfeld
Burleson, Tex.	Hébert	Ruppe
Button	Helstoski	Sandman
Cahill	Kirwan	Saylor
Carey	Landgrebe	Scheuer
Callender	Leggett	Smith, N.Y.
Chisholm	Long, La.	Steiger, Ariz.
Clark	Lowenstein	Stuckey
Clay	Lujan	Sullivan
Conte	McClure	Ullman
Conyers	McFall	Widmalm
Dawson	McMillan	Wilson, Bob
Dent	Mathias	Wolff
Diggs	Minshall	Wright
Dingell	Mollohan	
Eckhardt	Morgan	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 356 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, and on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON), I call up House Resolution 379 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 379

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5554) to provide a special milk program for children. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, as evidenced by the reading of the resolution, House Resolution 379 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 5554 to provide a special milk program for children.

In many instances, the only whole fluid milk which many of our school-age children receive is through the special milk program.

The program has had the dual effect of encouraging increased consumption of milk by 17 million children as a nutritional measure and reducing purchases of dairy products by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Historically, dairy commodity programs under CCC have diverted between 4 and 5 percent of the Nation's milk production, and it therefore follows that eliminating the appropriation necessary for continuation of the special milk program in the interest of economy is a specious contention.

No imported milk or milk products are utilized in this program.

The volume of milk consumed under the program in 1968 amounted to more than 3 percent of the total nonfarm consumption of fluid milk. This was in addition to more than 3.1 billion half pints used in national school lunch program type A lunches; that is, lunches which include a serving of milk and which meet certain other nutritional requirements.

Each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia are currently participating in the program.

H.R. 5554 would extend indefinitely the special milk program authorization contained in section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act. Additionally, it would increase the appropriation authorization for the fiscal year 1970 and ensuing years by \$5 million—from \$120 to \$125 million.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 379 in order that H.R. 5554 may be considered.

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the remarks just made by my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK). I would like to further point out that this bill does make the act permanent. It was instituted in 1955 under the Commodity Credit Corporation. In 1961 the Agricultural Act authorized appropriations for the program, and this procedure was continued until 1966, when the present act was passed.

The current authorization for fiscal 1970 is \$120 million. The bill will increase this fund by \$5 million for 1970 and for all succeeding fiscal years.

In fiscal 1969 an estimated 17 million children in all 50 States and the District of Columbia will participate in the school milk program. The estimated cost for this fiscal year is \$103,314,000.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, this program is a very popular one, popular with

MISS ELIZABETH SCHOFIELD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5134) for the relief of Miss Elizabeth Schofield. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5134

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elizabeth Schofield, the fiancée of Bradley Curry, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a non-immigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Elizabeth Schofield is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Bradley Curry and is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Elizabeth Schofield, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Elizabeth Schofield, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Elizabeth Schofield as of the date of the payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA CAMILLA GIULIANI NIRO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5615) for the relief of Maria Camilla Giuliani Niro.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

the general public as well as with the milk industry.

My purpose in taking a few minutes of time is to point out that even though it is a popular program it does not seem to be exactly what the last administration or the new administration had in mind, and apparently both of them had in mind a better use of the resources provided by this program for nutritional aids, especially to needy children.

To support that contention I would direct the attention of the Members to page 226 of the budget of the United States presented by the Johnson administration. On that page it is clearly indicated that the special milk program is stricken completely from the budget. The Johnson administration did not ask for one dime to extend into the 1970 budget the special milk program.

It is also a fact that the Nixon administration has not requested the reinstatement of this program or any part thereof.

I made inquiry of the Bureau of the Budget yesterday to find out the attitude of that Agency, and was told that the Bureau of the Budget opposes this program for two reasons: One is that the money provided in it is not sufficiently directed toward the needs of needy children. They stated to me that last year only \$7 million of the \$104 million spent under this program provided special benefits to children of the poor—and they define poor as families with an annual income under \$3,000.

They also said that they oppose the program because the U.S. Department of Agriculture had not asked for it. The Department of Agriculture is the Agency that has carried forward the administration of this special milk program.

From this, it is very apparent to me that at the administration level at least, there is a desire to see a redirection—and with that in mind, at the appropriate time I plan to offer an amendment to the bill that will come on page 2 which will strike out the language which has the effect of tying down the administration of this program to the same rules and procedures that were followed in the past years and gives the Secretary of Agriculture the flexibility to direct as nearly as practicable this program as a nutritional aid to needy children.

Now just how much change in the program this language would effect, I do not know. But I think whatever change it does effect, it would be to the good.

I would point out further to this body that my amendment would leave intact the program at the amount specified and it is not a cut in funds.

Nor does it impair its permanency.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Is there any sense of priority in the gentleman's amendment—because evidently there is not any in the bill. Although you are talking about the poorer children not being given prior consideration, is it your intention that those children who under title I of the education law will get priority, and even those schools that get priority, that the impoverished children in these schools get priority? And from then on

that all of the children shall be given the benefit of the program. Is that the purpose of your amendment?

Mr. FINDLEY. It is indeed to give the Secretary of Agriculture first of all greater flexibility. Second, to direct him to redirect this program as much as possible as nutritional aid to needy children.

This would mean needy children whether they live in a wealthy school district or in a poor school district. Presently, there are some school districts where needy children can get milk under this program without cost, but this is not true uniformly throughout the United States. It would be my expectation, if this amendment does get into the bill, that the Secretary of Agriculture would indeed redirect it more to the needs of the needy children.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. If the gentleman will yield further, to me the word "expectation" is not strong enough. I would like a stronger word than the word "expectation"—that the Secretary of Agriculture will direct these priorities.

Mr. FINDLEY. The door is still open.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would draw the attention of the gentleman to the language of the bill as revised by my proposed amendment and it would read this way:

The Secretary shall administer the special milk program provided for by this section to the maximum extent practicable as a nutritional aid to needy children.

So the needs of needy children would come first and the needs of others would be met only after the needs of the needy children had been satisfied. That is how I would interpret this.

If the gentleman from New York has a better amendment to accomplish more directly and more completely the nutritional needs of the needy children under this program, I would be glad to hear it.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank my colleague very much.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. How does the gentleman define the word "needy"?

Mr. FINDLEY. The amendment does not define it, but it is a well understood word. I think it is also a term of legal art—meaning those families with annual incomes under \$3,000 a year.

Mr. RYAN. In other words, is it the gentleman's intent to apply his amendment to children from families having an income of less than \$3,000 a year?

Mr. FINDLEY. It would be directed toward meeting their needs first before the needs of others would be met under this program. It would not, however, mean that these other children would be without milk because the testimony in the hearings showed very clearly that even if this program were abolished, the Department of Agriculture would not expect the consumption of milk in these schools to go down at all.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I am deeply concerned about any provision which would establish any kind of means test, which would differentiate the children in the schools and label one child as needy and another as not.

Mr. FINDLEY. I share the gentleman's concern on that point, and while I am not an expert in this field myself, I have been told that school leadership has found means, to use that same expression, of dealing with this problem without casting any onus upon those who are classified as qualified for the help.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS).

(Mrs. GRIFFITHS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support Mr. FINDLEY's amendment. If that amendment should fail, I intend to vote against this bill. This bill is not necessary at this time. Most other authorizations on other subjects that have come from the Agricultural Committee have been 1-year authorizations. This is a permanent authorization, unlike most others.

The Johnson administration did not intend to have this bill at all. I think that Mr. Nixon has every right to look over this bill and his welfare plans and make his determination of whether or not he wants this bill or whether or not he wants the money put into the school lunch program.

As you are aware, today milk is supplied in the school lunch program. This milk program is in addition to that. It is not directed toward needy children. The Johnson administration wanted the milk program directed toward needy children. In my opinion, while all children who want the milk should have it, certainly the needy should get it.

There is no rush whatsoever for this bill. There is an authorization extending now through 1970, so that you do not need to vote for this bill. No child is going to be hurt.

Give the administration, which is already having a difficult enough time, an opportunity to set up its own school lunch program and its own welfare program. Let them come in here and say what they like. I think they are owed that right and that respect.

I am going to vote with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) and if he does not prevail, I am going to vote against this bill, and I would certainly urge anyone else who is for giving the administration a chance to make its recommendation to oppose this bill.

(Mrs. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mrs. GRIFFITHS) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not against giving needy children in this country enough milk to drink. I think everyone here knows that my record reflects a strong desire to assure adequate nutrition for every child, and for every American. The reason I am appearing here this morning is to make some comments which I think deserve to be made about this legislation—what it reflects

and represents on the part of the Committee on Agriculture.

Ever since the start of the 90th Congress, the Committee on Agriculture has taken the position that programs of Government which it authorizes should be extended for only 1 year at a time, and thus be made subject to mandatory review every year to see if they should be continued, expanded, reduced, or eliminated. Both in 1967 and in 1968, the House Committee on Agriculture adamantly insisted on this policy as it affects the food stamp program, which is not one of its favorite Government programs. Whenever the House has overturned the recommendations of the House Committee on Agriculture on the food stamp program, as we did in 1964, 1967, and 1968, the conferees from the House put up such a strong fight in conference for the House position that for some strange reason we always lost or had to suffer a severe setback from what the House had actually passed.

But when the peanut industry or the dairy industry or any other commodity group comes to the House Committee on Agriculture to ask for legislation, it seems to have very little difficulty in getting what it wants, even if it runs counter to the policy of the Committee itself, as this bill, H.R. 5554, appears to do. This is not a 1-year extension of the milk program—it is an indefinite permanent extension of the special milk program.

We asked for the same thing for the food stamp program in 1964 and in 1967 and in 1968 but we were turned down by the Committee on Agriculture. So perhaps one might say that I am appearing this morning in order to cry over spilled food stamps. That is not exactly it.

Time after time, the Members of Congress who do not have any farms in their districts have voted—as I always have—for legislation to aid the farmer. In recent years, however, we have had to withhold our votes from time to time in order to impress upon the House Committee on Agriculture that there was some legislation we were interested in that also deserved their support or at least their permission to let us vote on it. It is no secret that food stamp bills were enacted in recent years only because the House Committee on Agriculture let them out of committee in the hope that advocates of the food stamp program would then vote for some pending farm bill; it is also no secret that farm bills in recent years have been enacted only because those of us who were strong for the food stamp program voted for both pieces of legislation. Every time I mention that connection, however, some people express great shock over this kind of legislative logrolling and dealmaking. Nevertheless it has been a fact of life about the food stamp legislation and about farm legislation for the last 5 years.

I think the Committee on Rules should be aware of the fact that there is no urgency whatsoever about the enactment of H.R. 5554. The Johnson administration did not ask for this legislation—President Johnson's budget for the 1970 fiscal year shows that he wanted the special milk program ended on June 30 of this year and the money which now goes

into the special milk program be added to the school lunch program so that every school could have hot lunches.

The new administration has not made up its mind yet whether it wants the special milk program continued, as this bill proposes into the indefinite future, or eliminated, as President Johnson's budget recommends. I understand that the spokesman for the Department of Agriculture who appeared before the Committee on Agriculture said they would need about 3 weeks in which to make up their mind about their policy position on this matter. So why the rush on this bill?

Apparently it is being pushed through only in order to give the House some legislation on which to act. But this bill, as of right now, is completely unnecessary. The special milk program authorization enacted in 1966 continues through the 1970 fiscal year for the amount of \$120 million. This bill would raise that authorization for fiscal year 1970 and all succeeding fiscal years to \$125 million. But the special milk program has never spent more than about \$100 million. So I think we can wait at least for 3 weeks or so for the new administration to make up its mind whether it wants to adopt the Johnson position on this matter or the one put forward by the House Committee on Agriculture and the dairy industry or some new position of its own.

And if the House has no legislation on which to act because this bill is held up, it is not the fault of the House. The new administration has been in office for 2 months and had 2 months before that to make up its mind about any of the basic and fundamental issues on which Congress will have to legislate, but there have been virtually no recommendations as yet for legislation from the White House. The fact that there is little legislation on the floor should not embarrass us as long as the committees are holding hearings and working on legislation as they are doing.

I do not remember any Congress in which I have served which made much of a record during the first 3 months of the first session. But some of them made excellent records before they were finished. And I think that is the test.

But to get back to H.R. 5554, I think it should cool off a few weeks until we know what the new administration wants to do about this \$100 million special milk program, and perhaps by then we might have some indication out of the administration whether it is going to send up a supplemental budget request for the \$40 million authorized but not yet appropriated for the expansion of the food stamp program for the remainder of this fiscal year and whether it is going to ask for changes in the food stamp act to remove the extremely restrictive ceilings agreed upon in conference last year for the food stamp program for the 1969 and 1970 fiscal years after the House had voted overwhelmingly to remove any ceilings on appropriations under the program.

So, to repeat, H.R. 5554 is not necessary at the present time because funds have already been authorized for the 1970 fiscal year for the special milk

program, and the figure is higher than the Department of Agriculture has ever spent for this program in the past. Furthermore, the new administration has not had a chance to decide whether it wants to continue this program at all. I might add that the dairy industry, which is so anxious to push through this legislation to assure a \$100 or \$125 million market in the schools for milk, over and above the large amounts spent for milk in the school lunch program, has a history of opposing the food stamp program because the spokesmen for this industry were afraid if people had food stamps which enabled them to buy any kind of food they wanted to—domestically raised food—in the grocery stores—the market for surplus butter and cheese would be reduced and the Government would have difficulty in getting rid of all of its surplus dairy products which are purchased under price support. Also, they were afraid that people in the food stamp program would buy margarine instead of butter, and therefore they should not be permitted to have a food stamp program unless they were required to buy butter with their food stamps.

I do not think this is the kind of attitude that should be rewarded with the hasty enactment of a special interest bill.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will look very carefully at the Findley amendment and realize what he proposes to do. I hope it will be defeated. I hope the committee's recommendations will prevail. I think we should look at the genesis of this bill. Originally the milk program was passed to provide enriched nutrition or improved nutrition for all youngsters in America. This bill is one of the few instances in which the middle-income American, who today is having a really rough time trying to make ends meet, gets some assistance from his Government. In Chicago we serve 150,000 half pints of milk every day in our elementary schools. Some of this milk is served in schools where they do not have a lunchroom, where they give the youngsters a milk supplement during the midmorning. Underprivileged children get the milk for nothing. Those children from families who are not indigent, pay 4 cents. These children would be paying 15 cents for a half pint of milk without the benefit of this program.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics recently reported \$9,700 a year to keep a family of four in Chicago, and the figure is comparable in other cities of the country. Who is going to speak for the middle-income American who is paying for all these programs?

There is much discussion around here about all these programs going to the needy. I yield to no one in my support of programs for the needy. My record of concern for the needy is deep rooted. The White House has just issued a report that it will issue an additional \$600 million in food stamps for the needy of this country. This is great, fine, wonderful. However, I do not think we ought to take milk away from the little child whose

father happens to make \$6,000 or \$7,000 a year and who already has a tough enough time providing for his family. I think it would be a great retrenchment if this Congress would go along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY). I join in his concern for the poor and for the undernourished and for the needy, but I think somewhere along the line we ought to give all American kids a break.

This bill was originally passed to help all the children in public and private schools to get a midmorning lift from fresh milk. Children all over the country are benefiting from this. I say it would be a great disservice to them to kill this program.

It is bad enough that both the Johnson administration and Nixon administration have cut the funds for this program drastically. If this authorization is approved today, we hope we can persuade the Appropriations Committee of the need for full funding.

I must point out to the gentleman from Illinois that the middle-class American is in revolt. He is watching all these programs going one way and he gets nothing. I say this milk program is one little enclave where he does get a little help for his own children. Do not take this away from his kids.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Moss was allowed to proceed out of order.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I read in the newspaper yesterday the following article:

UNITED STATES EASES FAT LIMIT IN SAUSAGES

The Agriculture Department has backed down on its proposed 30 percent fat limit for hot dogs, vienna sausages and bologna, and now is thinking of allowing up to 35-percent fat. But it hopes to force manufacturers to say on the label what percentage of the product is fat.

The Department announced yesterday that a proposed regulation with the 30-percent fat limit, issued in the waning days of the previous Administration, was being rescinded and hearings on the issue scheduled for June 18 to 20.

The meat packing industry has strongly opposed the 30 percent limit. The fat content of hot dogs has been oozing steadily upward over the past generation—partly because fat is cheaper than meat for the packers, partly because, the packers claim, the public likes its hot dogs not so dry. In the 1930s, the average fat content was 18.6 percent; today it is about 31.2 percent.

Mr. Speaker, if that recession from the order of the previous administration was for the purpose of lowering the fat content, I would be most enthusiastic, because I think 30 percent approved by the previous administration was a shocking imposition on the consumers of this Nation, and I think it has an adverse effect upon the health of the people who buy these products.

We all know there is a certain amount of controversy in the medical profession over the country over the question of cholesterol, but no doctor recommends we eat fat to the extent of more than one-third of the meat we consume. I strongly urge the Department of Agriculture to reconsider and look toward a

revision of the fat tolerance in these products to be more closely in line with that of the 1930's than the outrageous figure of 30 percent and what would become a shockingly outrageous figure of 35 percent.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that this special milk program has done an outstanding job over the years. There is no question that tens of thousands of children who have had a glass of milk to drink every day in our private and non-profit schools and many other areas particularly outside the public school area have benefited greatly in those areas where they have not had the school lunch programs. As far as I am concerned, I hope this resolution will be adopted and this bill will be passed.

To me, to oppose this bill or to vote against it, would simply be to oppose tens of thousands of youngsters having a glass of milk.

The SPEAKER. The time yielded by the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5554) to provide a special milk program for children.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5554, with Mr. OLSEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas, (Mr. POAGE), will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER), will be recognized for 30 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) on the motion he proposes to offer, and on his talk with the Bureau of the Budget—whomever he talked with—where they set a figure of \$3,000 as determining a "needy" family.

As I listened to the gentleman, the thought entered my mind, is \$3,000 a correct figure for a family of four, or five, or six? What about some concern for a family of one child?

I make this brief observation for the benefit of my colleagues. What is "needy"

in the case of one family might be one thing, and what is "needy" in the case of another family might be another thing.

Some families have six or eight or 10 children. Picking out the arbitrary figure of \$3,000, as to where the need would be, I would think could be particularly depressive upon large families.

I make that observation for the benefit of my colleagues.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the Speaker for yielding. I am glad to have this opportunity for clarification.

First, I should say that the definition of "needy" in terms of \$3,000 a year was my own. I believe my assumption is correct. The term "needy" was the one expressed in my conversation with the Bureau of the Budget.

I do believe that this is accepted as meaning \$3,000 a year for a family of four. Naturally, the money level would go up or down depending upon how many people were in the family.

I do thank the Speaker for this opportunity for clarification.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wanted to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the question of need is a very flexible one in accordance with the size of the family. What might not be a needy family in one case would certainly be an extremely needy family in another case. I wanted to make these remarks so that my colleagues would have them in mind.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the contribution by the Speaker.

I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5554, a bill to extend and to expand the special milk program for schoolchildren does two things. It increases by \$5 million the amount authorized to be appropriated each year from the present \$120 to \$125 million. It makes the program a permanent one, thus continuing indefinitely beyond its present expiration date, June 30, 1970.

No changes are made in the handling of this program. The administration of the program remains exactly the same under this bill as it is at present.

With the growing interest and research in nutrition and the increasing concern over the role poverty plays in malnutrition, this House might consider for a moment the development of the special milk program in the overall framework of the Federal public feeding programs.

Food aid as a Government function grew out of the depression period of the 1930's when, through such agricultural "adjustment" agencies as the Federal Farm Board, and later the Surplus Relief Corporation, surplus farm commodities were donated for relief purposes. One of the earliest measures designed to aid agricultural adjustment and simultaneously to distribute food was a 1935 amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. That amendment—section 32 of the act of August 24,

1935—has become a landmark in the Federal food-aid programs. The special milk program originated under section 32 as did the school lunch and the early food-stamp program.

Under section 32 the Secretary of Agriculture was given authority by the Congress to encourage the domestic consumption of major agricultural commodities through diversion, by payment of benefits or otherwise, from the normal channels of trade and commerce. The financing of this and the other provisions of section 32 was provided by appropriation of an amount equal to 30 percent of gross receipts from customs during the period January 1 to December 31, preceding each fiscal year.

Through the years specific and more detailed legislative authority was given for the donation by the Secretary of Agriculture of foods for school lunch programs by the act of June 4, 1946, Public Law 346 and succeeding agricultural measures. This act, and Public Law 78-129, the Department of Agriculture Appropriations Act of 1944, which for the first time authorized a specific amount of funds for the operation of school lunch and school milk programs, followed by several years' actual delivery of fluid milk to the schools purchased under section 32.

Beginning in 1954—Public Law 83-690—funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation were authorized to be used to provide fluid milk for children in nonprofit schools of high school grade and under. The program was extended and enlarged in subsequent years. By Public Law 84-465 in 1956 the milk program was extended to nonprofit nursery schools, child care centers, settlement houses, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of underprivileged children on a public welfare or charitable basis. By Public Law 85-478 in 1958 summer camps were added to the list of eligible child care institutions, the program was extended for 3 more years, and the authorization was increased to \$75 million per annum. The Agricultural Act of 1961—Public Law 87-128—extended the milk program through June 30, 1967.

Through enactment of the Child Nutrition Act in 1966—Public Law 89-642—the Congress incorporated in one measure the special milk program, a pilot school breakfast program, authority to aid in the purchase by public and nonprofit schools in low income areas of equipment necessary to initiate school lunch and school breakfast programs, and extension of school food assistance to pre school groups where operated as a part of a school system. All of these programs by that act were to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture and remain so now. H.R. 5554 would affect only section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, the special milk provisions.

Since this section of Public Law 89-642 expires next year, on June 30, 1970, it is understandable that the persons responsible for programing the expenditures of educational institutions now participating in the milk program have requested early action on this measure to assure adequate budgetary consideration.

This special milk program is one of a very few Federal food aids which is able to reach such a wide segment of our population—nearly 10 percent of our entire population and one-third of our school children. It provides incentives in the form of reimbursement payments for schools and other nonprofit child care institutions to supply their pupils with fluid milk. The payments are made by the Consumer and Marketing Service either to inaugurate school milk services or to expand it by offering milk at lower prices or at additional times. These milk payments apply only to the second and third half pints and do not include the initial half pints served as a part of the school lunch program. Any public school or any child educational institution which has been declared tax exempt is eligible.

Needy schools may, upon application, receive special assistance under this program so that they may serve milk without charge to needy children. In this case the reimbursement payments cover the total cost of the milk. Under the regular phase of the program the maximum Federal reimbursement payment is 3 cents per half pint of milk.

Within the States, the State educational agencies administered the special milk program in all public schools. In many States, this same agency also administers the program in nonprofit private schools and child-care institutions. A number of States are prohibited by State statutes from administering the program in eligible nonprofit private schools and institutions. In such States the Consumer and Marketing Service administers the program directly through agreements with these schools and institutions. The Consumer and Marketing Service also administers the program in outlets for which no State agency has assumed administrative responsibility.

Beginning in fiscal year 1968, available funds were apportioned among the States on the basis of payments made to schools and child-care institutions for program reimbursement during the preceding year. Each State agency is advised of the amount of funds available to it for program reimbursement during the preceding year. Each State agency is advised of the amount of funds available to it for program reimbursement during the entire fiscal year.

A letter of credit procedure permits State agencies to obtain funds to pay claims on hand by filing appropriate documents, through normal banking channels, with the Federal Reserve banks. Funds are available to the States for prompt payment of claims. Federal funds are withdrawn from the Treasury only as needed by the States for payment of claims. No Federal funds are used by the State agencies for administering this program in the States.

From fiscal years 1955 to 1968, the number of outlets participating in the program has more than doubled, and the number of half pints served has increased more than six times.

In fiscal 1968, 94,422 schools and child-care institutions served an estimated 2,987.5 million half pints of milk. Of

these, 88,042 were schools and 6,380 child-care institutions.

Nutritionists have long contended that children of school age need a minimum of one quart of milk per day to insure sufficient calcium intake. The special milk program has made good inroads toward correcting this deficiency.

Progress continues to be made under the special milk program—since 1960 the number of students served has increased by one-third, from 13 to 17 million, and the number of participating outlets has been increased by nearly 15 percent.

The above is further strengthened by the fact that, in many instances, the only whole fluid milk which many of our school-age children received is through the special milk program.

With 17 million schoolchildren participating, the current annual program consumption is approximately 3 million half pints in 94,500 institutions. These are spread over the 50 States and the District of Columbia. The volume of milk consumed by this program represented more than 3 percent of the total non-farm consumption of fluid milk in 1968. Certainly, this program, in addition to encouraging increased consumption of milk as a nutritional measure has also had the effect of reducing purchases of dairy products by the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is suggested that passage of this measure, making the program permanent and increasing the maximum authorization from \$120 to \$125 million, is in the interest not only of child nutrition but of the dairy industry.

As I have pointed out, this bill proposes to do just two things: First, it extends the existing special school milk program for schoolchildren. The second thing is, it raises the authorization by \$5 million a year. The present authorization is \$120 million, and this bill would fix it at \$125 million. This is just a little leeway to take care of new institutions, new demands, and new requirements on the program.

The other part of the bill simply makes a permanent program out of this bill. This program has not been a 1-year program as I understood was suggested a while ago by one of the speakers although possibly I was incorrect in my understanding. This has most recently been a 4-year program. This present program does not expire until next June 30, 1970.

The reason for extending it now is that both producers and students may make their plans with some degree of certainty for some time in advance. If they are not given this opportunity, there is a great deal of wasted motion and wasted money both from the standpoint of the milk producers and the standpoint of the schools themselves. We can have a better program if we can rely on this program existing for some time to come.

Mr. Chairman, we have used a temporary program for a number of years and we have used it for what seems to the Committee on Agriculture to be a good, sound reason; namely, because we wanted to know that the program was working well and that we had any correctable defects taken out of the program before we made it permanent. I think that it is

a rather sound system to let any of these new programs work for a few years on a temporary basis and then possibly extending them from 1 year to 3 or 4 years, and then, after a number of years' experience with the programs, before making them permanent programs. That is exactly what we have done in this case. We have had the school milk program functioning for many years. It actually started back with the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. The amendment of 1935 authorized that section 32 funds be available for this and for other uses. We have found this program works well. Frankly, it is one of the most popular programs we have ever had in the way of providing nutrition for the people of the country and not just simply for needy children. It is for needy children, of course, but it is also for other children.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEN. I go along with the position taken by the gentleman that this has benefited all of the children and not only the needy children. However, does the gentleman see any possible objection to priorities in this situation, that is, first of all, that the needy children who are unable to obtain the nutrition or the milk necessary for them practically to survive should be given the milk first? Then, if there is any milk left over or any money left over, it should be distributed to those families and those children who can pretty well afford to purchase it for themselves. Can the gentleman see any objection to this priority?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, I do.

Mr. FARBSTEN. I would like to know what it is.

Mr. POAGE. Because this milk is not distributed, as the gentleman seems to indicate, to families. The distribution is made in the lunchroom and at the schoolhouse. The distribution is not made on the basis of poverty and it does not single somebody out as being a mendicant at the bar of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman will let me answer his question, I will yield to him.

It is a program that is available to all children. It is available whether their families are worth \$1 million or whether they have absolutely nothing. It helps everybody. And, if we have learned one thing as a result of the recent discussions on nutrition which have been so widespread—and a good discussion all over the country—I hope that we have learned that malnutrition is not a phenomenon confined to any one wage or property level. It is a phenomenon—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, we are seeking here today to deal not simply with hunger. We have gone through this on this floor several times and this com-

mittee has been upbraided for talking about hunger but, yet, when someone else talks about hunger that is something else. However, we are talking about nutrition. A child from the wealthiest home is just as subject to malnutrition as is a child from some other home, and we are seeking to deal with all of them. I want to answer the gentleman's question, but I wonder if the gentleman would answer a question of mine?

Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEN) believe in providing free textbooks for all children or for only the needy?

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, insofar as I am concerned I would supply textbooks to all the children. However, I would give priority to those schools that have the most needy children attending those schools.

Mr. POAGE. No. I decline to yield further to the gentleman. This is surely a similar situation to that of textbooks. The gentleman states that certain children should be given priority in the distribution of milk. However, he has not offered to give any such priority in regard to textbooks. He recognizes that all children need textbooks and I think they need textbooks. However, it is my opinion that all children need proper nutrition while they are going to school. If they are going to get the benefit of an education, they need to have the benefit of a strong and well-nurtured body, children from the most prosperous families as well as those from the most poverty stricken families.

Mr. Chairman, we are simply asking that we continue a program that has worked well for a good many years.

Now, no one found this fault until they found that the Washington Post was interested in publishing anything that anyone wanted to say about nutrition.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Agriculture, by a unanimous vote of all of us on both sides of the aisle reported this bill. So, we were not working to get in the headlines in the Washington Post or the Chicago papers because we are not running against Senator DIRKSEN, you understand, but we were interested in all the children and we are still interested in all the children. We have got a good program that we believe is good for all the children and we believe that it should be extended. That is what this bill does, if passed. It does provide a opportunity for nutrition to every child that goes to school in America, if they want to take advantage of it.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

(Mr. MAYNE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support H.R. 5554 which is designed to encourage the consumption of fluid milk by children throughout the United States through the setting up and continuation of a special milk program for children.

This legislation will materially improve the likelihood that our Nation's school-

children will be provided with an adequate supply of fresh, wholesome milk.

Last year through this program, 17 million children in 94,422 schools and institutions consumed 1.6 million pounds of milk provided by the people of the United States under a similar special milk program. Relying upon this program which is already underway, many schools and institutions which have been participating in the program have gone to the expense of providing the necessary equipment and personnel to provide and serve this milk.

In many instances they have changed and adapted class schedules to accommodate milk breaks for children at appropriate periods in their schedules.

Recent testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture, and surveys which have been done for the Office of Economic Opportunity, establish without question that proper nutrition is an absolute prerequisite to the educational process. It is imperative that children receive adequate nourishment while they are still in their most formative years, and that includes the early school years.

It has been demonstrated without any doubt that children who are gnawed by the pangs of hunger are frightfully handicapped in school, and that this is a very major reason for the retardation of the educative process among the poor.

The special milk program is a direct attack on this problem of malnutrition in our country. In view of recent studies which have so vividly illustrated the problem of hunger and malnutrition in so many areas of our country, it would be a very great mistake to eliminate or to weaken this program. While we of course want to continue to place principal emphasis on adequate milk for needy children, it is important that the bill be broad enough to improve the nutrition of all school children. It would be a great tragedy to weaken and undermine a successful ongoing program which has proved its worth so thoroughly. The scope of the bill should not be limited as proposed by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5554. This is a program that has operated well for a number of years and, as the previous speakers have indicated, a program that has been beneficial to all children.

Mr. Chairman, I very strongly favor improving programs which assist the poor or needy individuals of this country, and especially with respect to their nutrition, but here is a program that was intended to help provide adequate nutrition for all children in order that not only would they drink the necessary amount of milk, but also learn to consume what we consider as nature's most perfect food.

The problem of poor nutrition is not limited to the poor people of the coun-

try. There are a number of individuals—and we have seen articles concerning this, especially concerning young girls who, because of their diet, do not have the nutrition to become good mothers. And while 2 years ago there was testimony indicating that the nutrition of a mother did not affect the mental capability of a child, and the nutrition of the child in those early years did not affect the later mental development of the child, this year in the testimony before the other body on malnutrition and hunger, it was indicated in a number of studies that malnutrition does have a bad impact, and that poor diet or inadequate food does have an impact upon the mental development of the child, both prenatal and in the early years of the child.

Now, it is true that it is not as important after they get to school age as it is in those early, formative years, but it is still of tremendous importance.

We have had this special school milk program that has been operating a number of years, not only in conjunction with the school lunch program but for the children who do take part in the school lunch program, and bring their own lunches, and receive the added glass of milk. The milk is available to those who not only bring their own lunches but those who participate in the school lunch program. All students receive milk at a lower cost than commercial costs, but poor children may receive it free.

I share the feeling of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY). There ought to be special emphasis on needy children and we must continue to do this. I think this country should never permit a situation to occur where some people lack an adequate diet because of poverty or ignorance. This is a problem I hope we will continue to address ourselves to, to make certain that, first, there are adequate programs to feed the needy, and, second, that there is enough money for it. Later this Congress will consider such legislation.

But I do not think it is wise to limit this program for only the poor. One hundred and twenty-five million dollars is authorized here. Do not say, "Well, we will not make this program available to all children in the schools any more." We should not limit milk to any one group of children.

We have the financial means to give special emphasis for any program for the needy without taking it away from an ongoing program that is important to our schools.

At one time schools felt their only responsibility was to teach the three R's and that they did not have any other responsibility for the children to develop fully to assimilate their education.

There are other responsibilities that have been accepted by some of the schools, and one of them has been in nutrition.

So the expansion of the Child Nutrition Act, with its special milk program should now be made permanent rather than bring this up from year to year for an extension. I believe it was a wise move that the Committee on Agriculture took to make this program permanent. It is no

longer on a trial basis, it is one that is proven worthy and ought to be continued into the future for as long as we can imagine. This is an ongoing program and someday I would like to see the authorization increased over \$125 million when the need is there.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Is the \$125 million inadequate? Or is it enough to meet the needs of all the underprivileged children we are talking about and also provide enough for the other children?

Mr. QUIE. I think it is adequate for now, so far as the amount the Federal Government would expend in this program. But I think we will soon be back here again for an expansion of this authorization because as we learned through the Child Nutrition Act, the special needs of children in some communities, especially in some cities, I think is going to require some additional amount of money in the special milk program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be important for us to just remind ourselves very briefly and quickly of the original purposes of this act.

When it was enacted, it stated:

Sec. 2. In recognition of the demonstrated relationship between food and good nutrition and the capacity of children to develop and learn, based on the years of cumulative successful experience under the national school lunch program with its significant contributions in the field of applied nutrition research, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that these efforts shall be extended, expanded, and strengthened under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture as a measure to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children, and to encourage the domestic consumption of agricultural and other foods, by assisting States, through grants-in-aid and other means, to meet more effectively the nutritional needs of our children.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill.

The only problem with this bill is that it does not have enough money. The \$125 million that the committee is recommending will take care of all the needy children and then take care of additional children.

The gentleman from Illinois has spoken about and is concerned about the needy children. I do not question at all his motives. I am sure he is moved by the highest ideals. But I do question his judgment because if we were to have this program operated in the manner in which he proposes, he would provide milk only for the needy children and each little youngster walking into a school would be a walking personal advertisement that he is poor and so he is getting free milk—when all the other children are not getting milk.

The only other condition under which the other children can get milk, if the gentleman's amendment were to prevail, would be if a father or mother gave each of their children 15 cents a day and said,

"Buy a half pint of milk during the milk break."

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I have heard ample evidence and testimony before our subcommittee about the value of the morning milk break. That is what we are talking about here—a milk break in the morning when they give these youngsters a half pint of milk. This milk break is a great aid to education. It gives these youngsters a boost. For all sorts of reasons, poor children, rich children, and children of middle income frequently come to school after having a very meager breakfast or no breakfast at all. I think I know something about the subject. Most of the Members of the House know something about it if they have children. Very often it is difficult to get a child to eat his breakfast even if it is placed before him. So teachers in both private and public schools have welcomed this milk program, because the milk program does give them an opportunity to nourish the youngsters, provide a little more energy, and then they spend the rest of the morning in learning.

We have the hot luncheon program also. There again we provide aid for needy children except that many of our schools do have facilities for a hot lunch. The gentleman intends to disrupt the morning milk break with his amendment. It occurs to me we are doing a great injustice to the needy by stigmatizing them as needy, by identifying them, by saying, "We have a milk program only for the very poor children." We also hurt the youngsters who are not benefiting from it since they would have to pay for it under the amendment.

In Chicago we serve 150,000 half pints of milk every morning. All the needy children get it free. Those who can afford it pay 4 cents a half pint. The City of Chicago School Board subsidizes part of the cost of that milk and the Federal Government subsidizes the other part of that cost. But we do not distinguish those who receive the milk. The tray of milk is brought to the classroom and all the children get the milk. There is no distinction between rich and poor, the middle income or the needy.

I might tell my colleagues that the needy are everywhere. I have in my district Taft High School which is generally considered to be a school of middle-income people. Yet we found there were 87 children in that school that desperately needed financial assistance and got it under the Neighborhood Youth Corps. They were children whose own parents were dead and they were living with their grandparents who were on social security, or children whose parents were separated, with only the mother providing for the family's needs. One does not always easily identify existing need. That is why I suggest that this program has been a real bulwark, a real strength, a tremendously popular program because it has never publicly separated the rich from the poor.

This is not a partisan issue. Mr. Johnson recommended that this program be cut down to \$20 million. The present administration, I believe, has not yet taken a position. So no one can say here that it is a partisan issue. I think Mr. Johnson

was wrong. He was badly misadvised, and those who advised him said, "We will cut this program out because we are going to supplement it with the hot lunch program. We are going to supplement this program and give these youngsters the additional nutrition they need during the lunch hour."

What Mr. Johnson's advisers completely ignored was that all over America there are thousands of elementary schools that do not have facilities for hot lunches, do not have a cafeteria, do not serve a hot luncheon in school, and the morning milk break is really one of the great programs for bringing extra nutrition to youngsters. I would hope that we would make it a permanent program.

As we said when we originally passed this bill, there is a correlation between nutrition and the ability of a child to retain his interest in his studies and absorb his studies.

I certainly commend my colleague from southern Illinois for his concern about the poor, and I think that anybody who examines my record around here will see my support and deep concern for the poor. As the gentleman from Minnesota just said, however, I do not think we ought to set up this program only for the needy, because I think to do so would defeat its purpose. My judgment is that if you were to make this program only for the needy, the needy children would be too embarrassed to benefit from it, and we could forget the whole program.

So in all good conscience, and with all sincerity, I hope my colleague will not offer the amendment, and if he does, I hope it will be defeated, simply because, in my judgment, the present program is working well. It is one of the most popular programs in America. Talk to any father or mother and you will find that he or she is grateful that his youngster gets a half pint of fresh milk during the morning break. I say to you it would be an act of cruelty to take this help away from the people who are today struggling all over this country. As I said earlier, the man who is trying to bring up a family of six or seven children is having a rough time and needs this little help.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD).

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5554, a bill to provide a special milk program for children.

During the previous 8 years that I have served the people of Vermont in the House of Representatives, I have supported the special milk program for children and have taken the floor of the House to speak in favor of this very important and meritorious program. On occasions I have also appeared before the Committee on Agriculture to indicate my support for the school milk program and to urge expansion of the program to include nonprofit institutional use of milk in such places as summer camps, nursery schools, child care centers and so on.

This additional step was taken under the provisions of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

I wish to commend the chairman of the committee, Mr. POAGE, and his colleagues on the committee for bringing out the bill in its present form which increases the authorization for the program for the next fiscal year to \$125 million and more importantly puts the program on a permanent basis with a similar authorization for each succeeding year.

I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) such time as he may consume.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) to provide a special milk program for children.

H.R. 5554 would amend section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 by establishing a permanent milk program for our school children and by authorizing an expenditure of \$125 million for fiscal year 1970 and each succeeding fiscal year.

The advantages of the school milk program are obvious to all of us who are concerned with the intense problems caused from malnutrition and lack of a proper diet. It is a known fact that a child's diet has everything to do with his progress, development and future performance in society. Since its inception in 1954, the school milk program has expanded to serve 94,422 schools and child care institutions and 17 million youngsters in all 50 States and the District of Columbia. In my city of Cleveland, approximately 20,000 children in 30 schools and three child day-care centers enjoy the benefits of the school milk program. Over 5,000 schools in the State of Ohio participate in the program.

Nutritionists contend that children need a minimum of one quart of milk a day to insure sufficient calcium intake. Youngsters in low income areas are particularly in need of the nutrients contained in milk and although much progress has been made in expanding the program, there continues to be a real need in many areas throughout the country for increased services and school participation.

Not only must we approve an additional authorization today, but we must work for the full appropriation adequately to fund the program. The future of our society is at stake and we have an opportunity to fulfill the need that exists here. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this most worthy legislation.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA).

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify one thing said earlier, that out of respect for the present administration we should not proceed with this legislation. It is

well known that the committee cooperated fully with the administration and we proceeded only after the administration agreed we should continue even though they had not as yet formulated their plans along this line. They offered no objection to it and offer no objection to our continuing with the legislation. They offer no objection now. I sincerely believe, because this legislation will fall into the sphere of their planned programs in this field.

Also, I would like to bring up the fact that for too long too many people have tried to make everything that comes before this House into a welfare program. We hear too much of the poor and hear too much of the disadvantaged from those who speak of it on the floor of this House or in front of television cameras or newspaper reporters, but whose actions are vastly different. The actions of those individuals are sometimes vastly different from actions that will provide for those in need.

I believe we should keep this as a program of health and not welfare. This is not a welfare program. This is a technical aid in nutrition for particular schools which like to avail themselves of it.

It is very difficult—possibly in my area more difficult than in many others, because we have so many poor people and many who try to take advantage of this legislation—but we cannot physically and technically say in the school, "You get this milk and you do not." We cannot do that when we go into the classrooms. It cannot be done. This is an aid to the schools which avail themselves of it.

So that the Members may be apprised of how the program is administered I would like to inform you that it is done by the School Lunch Division, Consumer and Marketing Service, of the U.S. Department of Agriculture under provisions of section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. Locally, the program is administered in all public schools within a State by the State educational agency. In many States, this same agency also administers the program in nonprofit private schools and child-care institutions. A number of States are prohibited by State statutes from administering the program in eligible nonprofit private schools and institutions. In such States the Consumer and Marketing Service administers the program directly through agreements with these schools and institutions. The Consumer and Marketing Service also administers the program in outlets for which no State agency has assumed administrative responsibility.

And as to the success of said program, I would like to inform the Members that the effect of the special milk program on consumption was especially pronounced in low-income areas. In these low-income areas per capita intake of whole milk during the survey period averaged nearly 4 ounces more for children attending special milk program schools than for those attending other schools. The 4-ounce average represented rural and urban areas combined; the difference between low-income urban schools under the special milk program and those not under the program was even larger. The impact of the special milk program was smaller in schools serving medium-in-

come areas. Children in high-income areas drank milk at about the same rate whether or not their schools participated in the special milk program. Also, children from high-income areas attending special milk program schools drank nearly one-fifth again as much milk, and those attending other schools drank almost half again as much as children from low-income areas.

Progress continues to be made under the special milk program—since 1960 the number of students served has increased by one-third, from 13 to 17 million, and the number of participating outlets has been increased by nearly 15 percent.

The above conclusions are further strengthened by the fact that, in many instances, the only whole fluid milk which many of our school-age children receive is through the special milk program.

I therefore, respectfully implore the Members of the House who agree with me to support this legislation and not to support the amendments that will try to do away with these programs that have worked so well in all the schools for all the children, wherever they want to avail themselves of it and where they need this program.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Illinois is leaning on some pretty thin reeds in his argument.

For example, the gentleman asserted that the genesis of this program was the nutritional needs of children. Nothing could be further from the truth. As the hearings of the Congress testify, this program began because the milk industry at that time had heavy surpluses and it was recognized as an industry program, not as a program to help the children.

Frankly, it has been of great help to the children, but if the gentleman is leaning on that reed, it is a pretty thin one.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I will yield, if the gentleman will yield me some time if I need it.

Mr. POAGE. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. I just wanted to know if the gentleman felt the program was to be condemned because possibly it had helped children in the country. Is that something with which we should condemn the program?

Mr. FINDLEY. No, but I should like to see us be a little more precise and accurate in the labeling we put on our proposals and in our reciting of history, because this clearly began as a surplus dumping program.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) also placed special emphasis on the danger, if my amendment should take effect, that this would be a program just for the needy. Well, how about that?

One would have to assume from that that a lot of needy children, therefore, are not getting the benefit of this program today. And that of course is true.

There is nothing in this program which assures that a poverty-stricken child is going to get some milk at school. There are a few exceptions. There are some schools which have a program under which the poor children get their milk free, but not all schools, by a long shot. A lot of needy children are simply foreclosed because they do not have the money.

So that is a pretty thin reed to lean on, too.

If the argument really means there is so much unmet need among the school-children of the United States that this amendment would sop up the \$130 million or whatever is provided annually by this program, with nothing left for the people who have money, then we do indeed have a serious problem, and this makes all the more important the amendment I expect to offer.

Furthermore, there is no need for any stigma whatever to be attached to a child who gets milk free under this program. In carrying out the free programs in some of our schools today there has been no stigma; at least, I have not heard of any at all. There is a provision of tickets for milk. Of course they use tickets instead of cash, and free distribution can be handled in such a way that there is no stigma whatever.

I hope we will consider this on the merits. This is not a program to take milk away from wealthy children. They will continue to get but conceivably will have to pay a little more for it. It is to redirect the resources as far as practicable to the nutritional needs of the poor children.

What could be more perfectly in harmony with the objectives of our Government today?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Illinois obviously did not hear me read to the House the preamble to the law approved by Congress when we started this milk program. I do not know how the gentleman draws his conclusion from the hearings about a surplus of milk and an effort to help the milk industry. I presume that when this great body, this deliberative body, incorporates a preamble in a bill, it means something.

Is the gentleman prepared now to suggest that the House did not mean what it said, that somehow or other it was engaged in some sort of hypocrisy and sweet and clever words to obscure or conceal the fact that we wanted to help the milk industry? Or were the Members of Congress who voted for this bill honestly and sincerely interested in helping provide better nutrition for the children in this country?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. I am sure the gentleman will agree there are many instances in which this Congress has put excessively attractive labels on legislation intending to make it look really better than the content would justify.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I hope the gentleman is speaking only for himself, because he is certainly not speaking for me in that conclusion.

So far as the need is concerned, obviously the amendment the gentleman would offer would limit this milk program only to the needy. Nothing in what I said would mean there are a lot of needy now not getting this help. Does the gentleman know of any child in the State of Illinois who is needy, where there is a milk program in the school, who is not getting free milk?

Does the gentleman know of any such child? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Frankly, I do not have the details, but I have been informed by the Department of Agriculture that there are select schools through which children without money can receive milk under this program, but the Bureau of the Budget has stated only \$7 million of the \$104 million provided last year went to the benefit of these children. I think that is answer enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Resuming what I said before, our colleague from southern Illinois has gone all around, but the fact of the matter is if his amendment were to prevail, only poor children would be able to participate. That means every child having a carton of milk in a classroom during a morning break would automatically be identified and labeled as a member of the poor. I submit to you even at that tender age children have pride and honor. I submit to you that many children would pass up the milk simply because they would not want to be stigmatized the way my colleague proposes to do. Right here in the Washington, D.C., area I studied public schools and we found that they had a program where children had to get a special ticket for free lunch. We saw that children were not accepting the free lunch because they were embarrassed and ashamed that they were on relief and needed public aid. Do you think that there is no pride among young people? There is. I suggest that the bill we have is a good one. I respect my colleague for offering his amendment but certainly question his judgment in offering it.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

(Mr. CARTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, what is milk? Why, it is a lacteal fluid extracted from the udder of the female of the bovine species and highly prolific to the nth degree. Milk contains approximately 4.5 percent butterfat, which may or may not be healthful because of its content of cholesterol. On the whole, however, I think it is extremely healthful and in fact the most complete food we have. It lacks only one element, and that is iron.

The mewling and puking infant comes into the world completely sustained by nourishment provided by his mother's breasts or by the overflowing generosity of the udder of the contented Jersey, Guernsey, or Holstein.

When a man's days become few and his eyes dim, sans eyes, sans teeth, sans everything, the most easily assimilated

and digested food is milk. It is a boon to the ill and fortifies the elderly.

In our school systems throughout our land the milk program has proven helpful and healthful. As an observer of the school lunch and milk programs, it has been my experience at the beginning of school in poor areas that youngsters can be seen coming in with skinny forms, scaling skin, sore lips—which are called rhagades—if you please. After a few hours one sees the forms fill out, the skin grow pink, and the eyes grow brighter.

I strongly support this legislation and would not limit its scope.

One nuclear submarine costs more than the entire program. Which will help our country more, our \$125 million milk program or one \$125 million nuclear submarine? Personally, I should like to see the program doubled. Suffer little children to have all the milk they want and deny them not.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON).

(Mr. BURLISON of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture yielding this time to me.

I would like to observe that it seems there are two areas of contention in this debate. One seems to me to be whether or no the bill should be made permanent or whether it should be temporary. There has not been a single statement or allegation here that the program has not worked in the past. Therefore, I think we all should be able to agree, at least on the basis of the debate here this afternoon, that the program should be permanent.

The second issue is whether we should provide the milk to all the people in our schools or whether it should be merely to the needy.

We have already run into a lot of difficulty as to what "needy" constitutes. The distinguished gentleman from southern Illinois said he believes that a \$3,000 income or anything below that is "needy." I would question whether "needy" means the same to a rural family in Missouri as to a family in an urban area in Illinois or any other State.

Mr. Chairman, I further question whether we need to draw the line on the recipients of this program as having to come under the definition of "needy." Is there something inherently wrong about a middle-class American, for instance, receiving some benefit from his Government? He is the one paying for it. If there is something inherently wrong about it, it has not been disclosed on the floor of this House today. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of the bill.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE).

(Mr. TEAGUE of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I shall offer a motion to recommit this bill primarily for one reason. In my district there are eight or 10 nonprofit private schools entirely aside from the Catholic and parochial schools. The parents of the children attending these schools are wealthy people—some of them very wealthy. I see no reason in the world why the small taxpayers should be asked to subsidize a milk program for the children of these private schools which obtain students from very wealthy families.

Mr. Chairman, I shall offer a motion to recommit the bill.

Let us not deceive ourselves. This is another farm subsidy program—not a welfare program for the needy and undernourished.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. KLEPPE).

(Mr. KLEPPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I think we have heard this afternoon some very excellent remarks from various Members as to the real good aspects of this program and I wish to join in those remarks and those observations. Particularly, I think the explanation given by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) was very timely and very much in order and very explanatory regarding this bill.

In my opinion it is a terrible mistake to think about doing anything that would jeopardize this program. The ongoing part of it, Mr. Chairman, has been such a wonderful program for so many.

I am very strongly in support of this legislation, and urge that the Members who are present will see to it that this bill passes, and passes with an overwhelming majority.

(Mr. KLEPPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ZWACH).

(Mr. ZWACH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5554 to make the child nutrition program permanent and to increase the authorization by \$5 million. Since its inception in 1954, this program has made noteworthy progress on the twin goals of providing a highly essential and nutritious source of nature's most nearly perfect food, and also providing a new outlet for a nutritious product which has been in surplus.

Under this program, the total consumption of milk during this past year was nearly 3 billion half-pints, or about 2 percent of the total milk production in the United States. This is one of the very best methods of making the greatest use of a product that might otherwise find itself in Government storehouses.

In my home State of Minnesota, we have accomplished a great deal under this program, not only because this is a food which we produce in abundance, but also because the program allows a

high degree of participation by State and local people.

This year in Minnesota, we have 1,968 public and private schools participating in this program. Last year there were 428 private schools on the special milk program and they consumed 10,425,082 half-pints of milk. In the public schools, it is estimated over 5 million half-pints per month are used by 798,961 students in 1,553 schools. This means that 99.8 percent of the public school enrollment is getting milk daily through either the special milk or school lunch program.

I strongly recommend that until all schools are able to participate in the school lunch program, this program should be extended by passing H.R. 5554.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. There are some aspects of it that concern me about some of what has been said.

First of all, this does not relate solely to the schools, and the Committee on Agriculture I believe, has done an exceptionally fine job in bringing this bill to the floor. I am sure that the Members have received letters and messages from such groups as the YMCA. For instance, the director of community affairs for the National YMCA in New York wrote as follows:

This is to express my deep concern for the current legislation now in committee regarding reimbursement of non-profit organizations for additional milk to be served children and youth in summer camp.

Over 500,000 boys and girls participate in the 1620 day camp and 490 resident camp operations of the Young Men's Christian Association annually. The extra quantities of milk made available by the federal government in recent years has been a real boon to the food nutrition for these children and youth campers. The current major thrust of the YMCA to meet the needs of children in low income families within our large urban areas has been visibly supported by the healthy inclusion of added quantities of milk on camp menus. Many of our children from inner city areas just do not have access to an essential milk supply. This legislation would insure continuance of this vital milk source.

It seems to me that this is one of the points which deserves to be considered as the Committee today wrestles with the question as to the portion available to those in low-income families. We would actually reduce the amount of milk consumed by approximately 2 billion half pints annually if we don't pass this legislation.

It has been estimated that some 66 percent of the 51 million schoolchildren have benefited from the milk program. Only 44 percent will benefit from the school lunch, special assistance, and breakfast programs, even after they are expanded. Approximately 94,500 schools and institutions have participated in the milk program. Under the proposed expanded nutrition programs only 82,000 schools will be included.

It seems to me that we should remember "Their Daily Bread," a study that

was conducted by a number of women's organizations in which they stated the following:

The federal government reimburses more than half the cost of the first pint of milk served with lunch and slightly more on every half pint served after that. This means that out of what the children pay on the balance, plus special reimbursement based on the number of half pints served free, there is enough money to serve milk free to needy children—a far higher percentage than receive a free lunch.

This study goes on to say:

It is easy to see that the milk program is working well.

I trust the action today on the floor will give some support to the Committee on Appropriations as they consider the budget submitted both by the Johnson administration and by the Nixon administration.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when we are accumulating an ever-increasing body of knowledge indicating severe problems of hunger and malnutrition, I believe it is vital to continue the special milk program.

This body recently passed a measure which will do a great deal to improve the school lunch program. I was an active supporter of that measure, and I will continue to work for substantial improvements in all of our nutrition efforts.

One of the problems we face with the school lunch and breakfast programs, however, is that even under an expanded program such as anticipated in the 1970 budget, many of the children, who so desperately need to participate, attend schools which lack the financial resources and food service equipment necessary for them to take advantage of school lunch and breakfast. These same children are frequently able, however, to take part in the milk program. Given this situation, it would indeed be unwise to eliminate one of our most effective and nutritious programs. Our aim should be to insure that all of the Nation's schoolchildren, and particularly those living in poverty, will receive nutritionally adequate and nourishing diets. The special milk program plays a vital part in this effort.

Mr. Chairman, this program has my complete support and I urge its continuation by Congress.

I heartily urge this bill be supported as being a program which has worked successfully for the benefit of the American dairy farmer and for the school and camp children in the United States.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in support of this program. I think it is a program that has served many purposes.

I think it has helped to promote the sale of milk and which has helped one of the segments of agriculture that has been hard hit during the past number of years because of inflation and the high cost of everything that the farmer has to buy.

In addition to that, I think it has had a tremendous nutritional value for school children. It has been very popular among the schools. It has been very popular among the dairy interests.

I have heard very little criticism of this program, which is not true of many of the farm programs that we have.

Mr. Chairman, I am in complete support of the bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to commend the gentleman for his statement, Mr. Chairman, and also for his recognition of the distress that affects large elements of our milk producing industry in the country today. I support this bill.

Unlike my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY), I do not see any great harm in benefiting an industry as important to our country as the milk producing industry.

It seems to me that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER) has made a fine statement in pointing out the problems that confront this industry today and in urging that this bill be advanced not only because of its benefit to children, but because it aids a major American industry as well.

I agree with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER) that we ought to double the program as soon as we can afford to do it because the children need it.

I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding to me.

Mr. BELCHER. I appreciate the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. MAY).

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5554, to extend indefinitely the special milk program authorization contained in section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

The Special milk program has been a highly successful and effective supplement to the diets of young Americans since 1954. When first started, the program reached only nonprofit schools of highschool grade and under, but now, children in other nonprofit child-care institutions such as nursery schools, summer camps, and settlement houses are also eligible for the benefits of the program.

Over the years, the program has been expanded to reach more and more children, and the amount of milk served has increased significantly. As our committee report points out, during the first year of program operation, 41,094 schools participated. Since then, the number of outlets has more than doubled, and the number of half pints served has increased more than six times.

The results of this program, Mr. Chairman, provide more than ample justification for extending it permanently and increasing its appropriation authorization to \$125 million. The program has made, and is continuing to make, a significant contribution to the health and nutrition of our young people. What better inheritance can this Nation give its

children than strong and healthy bodies and minds?

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to approve this legislation.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTAIN).

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not oppose this legislation, but I think the legislation can be improved and made better.

We have heard that there is opposition to the bill because those who are wealthy are being benefited by it. We have heard on the other hand that the bill should not be restricted to the poor.

Well, I offer you a middle road. I am going to offer an amendment to the effect that there will be priorities in the distribution of milk—first, the milk shall be given to schools participating in the expenditure of funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1969.

Under that act there is a provision that requires funding for schools attended by poor children to enable them to obtain education equal to wealthier children.

These children, in my opinion, should come first. Even ahead of them, when the milk gets to these schools, are to be the children whose households have incomes below the poverty index as established by the Social Security Administration.

After this priority has been taken care of, then I am satisfied that milk be given to everybody. It is a good food. It is a wonderful food. It is a blessing for all children, but I believe this situation calls for priorities and I shall offer an amendment to the bill at the proper time which shall provide for this priority.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have just been advised that we are going to have a second Findley amendment—to do the same thing. Both amendments would achieve the same result.

I do not know why we cannot have just one vote and determine which way the House wants to go—whether we want to make a relief program out of this or whether we want to maintain a nutrition program for all the people of the country. I think that is really going to be the only question involved here—that is whether we are going to try to maintain a nutrition program that will help every schoolchild in this country or whether we want to channel this off into another program or numerous other relief programs, by destroying the kind of program that has worked so well for everybody else for years.

If you feel that the program has been a failure and that you ought to have a new relief program, then you want to vote for one or both amendments because they do exactly the same thing. But if you do not feel that way, then you want to vote against these amendments and pass the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further requests for time? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5554

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for each succeeding fiscal year, not to exceed \$125,000,000, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules and regulations as he may deem in the public interest, to encourage consumption of fluid milk by children in the United States in (1) nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, and (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. For the purposes of this section 'United States' means the fifty States and the District of Columbia. The Secretary shall administer the special milk program provided for by this section to the maximum extent practicable in the same manner as he administered the special milk program provided for by Public Law 89-642, as amended, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969."

Mr. POAGE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATSUNAGA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATSUNAGA: On page 2, line 4, immediately after "fifty States" insert the following: ", Guam,"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized in support of his amendment.

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment upon the request of the ever-alert delegate to the Congress from Guam, the Honorable Antonio Won Pat. Although he is without official recognition, Mr. Won Pat has certainly been an effective ex-officio member of this House. My offering this amendment is a case in point.

Mr. Chairman, all that my amendment intends to do is to include the Territory of Guam in the well-accepted school milk program. By adopting the amendment, we will be extending the proven nutrition program to deserving American children living on American soil. I cannot foresee anyone objecting justifiably to this amendment, so I urge its adoption by a unanimous vote.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. POAGE. As far as I am concerned, we accept that amendment.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. We will accept it also.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: On page 2, on line 7, strike all after the word "practicable" and strike all of lines 8, 9, and 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "as a nutritional aid to needy children."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, it has been a little bit hard for me to believe my ears here today when I reflect upon the language in my amendment and the disastrous consequences that some of my colleagues say it would bring about. I just have trouble believing my ears, because my amendment does nothing more than to direct the Secretary of Agriculture, to the extent practicable, to use the resources of this program as a nutritional aid to needy children.

Well, there has been a lot of talk that this program ought to make milk available to all children who want it. Those who really believe in that gospel ought to support my amendment, because my amendment would bring this a lot closer to reality than it is today.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Is the \$125 million provided in the bill not meant for the needy? Why should not the opponents increase the amount instead of trying to limit the bill to this way.

Mr. FINDLEY. I will have to answer the question in this way. I do not know. This represents a substantial increase, and it is 100 percent more than the Johnson administration wanted or that the Nixon administration has requested. I think it is also important for us to reflect on this fact, that this program does not give the assurance of benefit to poor children. It simply does not. It provides the assurance of benefit to children if they have the money. It does not provide benefit to children who may not be able to afford even the subsidized price. So those who really believe in this idea, which I certainly share, that every school child who wants it should be able to have a half pint of milk during the morning break, should certainly support my amendment, because it is going to bring that ideal condition a lot closer to reality than it is today.

I do not want to rehash the arguments we have gone through here, but I just hope that those who are sincerely interested in the nutritional needs of young people will support the amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman's amendment were adopted, it would mean, of course, that the milk under this program would not be available to the institutions I referred to a few moments ago—in other words, the private schools, and we are

not talking about the parochial schools, but the schools where parents pay tuition fees of \$1,500 to \$2,500 a year for their children to attend. I assume the gentleman would agree they are not needy children.

Why should a taxpayer, who has an income of, let us say, \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year, paying \$200 or \$300 a year in income taxes, have part of his taxes go to pay for subsidized milk for children in this category, those attending private schools whose parents are wealthy? Would the amendment offered by the gentleman eliminate that?

Mr. FINDLEY. I will say it will not necessarily eliminate that, but it will require the Secretary of Agriculture to give priority to the needy children first, and then if there is any money left over in this fund through which milk to wealthy children could be subsidized, that would be permissible and, no doubt, would occur.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this item was discussed by the gentleman in general debate. I wonder, if there is no one who feels he just has to make another speech, if I might move that all debate close.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw that and I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Pucinski).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Illinois would have the House believe his amendment is a very innocent little thing and is just intended to make some minor changes in the program. I think the House should know what the amendment does. The language in H.R. 5554, as reported by the committee, reads—and if the Members have a copy of the bill, I refer them to line 5 on page 2, which says:

The Secretary shall administer the special milk program provided for by this section to the maximum extent practicable in the same manner as he administered the special milk program provided for by Public Law 89-642, as amended, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

What the committee is doing now is continuing the program as it has been practiced, providing milk to needy children and providing milk to those who are not needy at reduced rates.

What does our colleague propose to do? He proposes that we strike the words "in the same manner as he administered the special milk program provided for by public law" and so on, and it would read, if his amendment were adopted:

The Secretary shall administer the special milk program provided for by this section to the maximum extent practicable as a nutritional aid to needy children.

What the gentleman's amendment would do—and let there be no question about this, even though I saw him stand in the well and say he did not see what we were all getting excited about because the amendment does not do anything, but the fact is the amendment offered by the gentleman cuts the guts out of this program and makes this a welfare pro-

gram for supplemental milk to needy children only.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, again the gentleman has said, as others have said, that this program reaches all poor children. No, it does not. It reaches all children who can pay or for whom their own districts provide the payment.

I would like to point out to the gentleman from Chicago that not all of us are from Chicago and not every child in America is getting this milk, contrary to the opinion that is being expressed here.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully regret I cannot yield any further for I want to have a moment to say that if all children are not getting milk, then the gentleman from Iowa gave her the answer. If the gentlewoman from Michigan and the gentleman from Illinois are interested in assuring that every single youngster in this country will get fresh milk if he is in need, then the answer, as the gentleman from Iowa said, is to increase the authorization, but do not cut it out.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, that is not true. They already have more authorization than has ever been used.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield any further.

Mr. Chairman, the language the gentleman is substituting in his amendment simply reads, "as a nutritional aid to needy children." That is all. Let there be no question about what the gentleman is proposing here. Adoption of this amendment will mean that millions of children would be denied fresh milk at reduced rates in their classroom.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. FINDLEY.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FINDLEY) there were—ayes 8, noes 85.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARBSTEIN

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARBSTEIN: On page 2, line 5, after the period, insert the following new sentence: "Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be made available on a priority basis to schools participating in the expenditure of funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1969; and within those schools shall first be made available to children from households which have no income or have incomes below the poverty index as established by the Social Security Administration."

(Mr. FARBSTEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not angry with anybody. I want to help everybody.

I want to help the poor kids, and if there is something left over let it go to the rich ones. I think everybody should have milk.

But I say that the poor kids should get it first. If, after they have had it, there

is some left over, let it go to the YMCA. The poor kids are the ones whose families are unable to afford the milk; the nutrition that is necessary.

This is fine. We have \$125 million in the budget. I do not know what the population explosion is going to do. I do not know what the Appropriations Committee will do. Suppose that is cut down to about \$75 million. I think the milk should not be divided equally under those circumstances. I think there should be priorities, and the priorities would be those which were read in the amendment.

First the milk would go to those schools under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969. That provides funding for the schools attended by poor children to enable them to attain education equal to that of the wealthy children.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. As I understand the amendment, it would eliminate the YMCA, because the YMCA is not a school, from the program. It would eliminate those 5,000 very poor children sent to summer camp by the YMCA in New York City; is that correct?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Under the terms of this amendment of mine the schools would get it first, and particularly those schools that are preferred because of the education law. We presume that these kids will go to school, and go to school in the areas that are depressed. Hence they would be primarily entitled to milk.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. But the YMCA is not a school, so it would not be included in the priorities.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. They would get the milk when they went to the school.

They would have their milk in the morning and then if there was some left over and they wanted some in the afternoon, they could get it by going to the Y. They would not be deprived. However, we come back to the original premise.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Iowa asked a question which is a fair question. Under the language of your amendment you are in fact saying that the funds shall be allocated to schools which receive title I money and in those schools to those who are eligible under the poverty line established by the Social Security Administration. For all practical purposes you are then eliminating those participating in other programs other than a school from receiving the benefits of the special milk program. That includes those in the YMCA and it includes those in such programs as—

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Just a moment. I understand what you say.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. And others now enjoying the benefits.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Please. I refuse to yield. Let me answer you.

Under the terms of the amendment it says "shall remain available on a priority basis." All I do now is repeat what

I said earlier. After the poor school kid and the poor kids in the poor schools get their milk, if there is any left over, it will go to the others. The way you cure that is by appropriating sufficient funds to see that everybody is taken care of, but so long as you restrict the amount of funds insofar as the purchase of milk is concerned, I say that these priorities do not prevail.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Of course, the gentleman from Texas was recognized on this amendment a while ago when it was under the name of the Findley amendment. I hardly think it is proper to speak on the same amendment twice, and I do not believe there is any real occasion for any of us speaking on it twice.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLSEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5554) to provide a special milk program for children, pursuant to House Resolution 379, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5554 to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 384, nays 2, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—384

Abbutt	Dwyer	Lipscomb
Adair	Eckhardt	Lloyd
Adams	Edmondson	Long, La.
Addabbo	Edwards, Ala.	Long, Md.
Albert	Edwards, Calif.	Lukens
Alexander	Eilberg	McCarthy
Anderson,	Erlenborn	McClory
Calif.	Esch	McCloskey
Anderson, Ill.	Eshleman	McCulloch
Andrews, Ala.	Evans, Colo.	McDade
Andrews,	Evins, Tenn.	McDonald,
N. Dak.	Fallon	Mich.
Annunzio	Farbstein	McEwen
Arends	Fascell	McFall
Ashbrook	Feighan	McKneally
Ashley	Findley	McMillan
Aspinall	Fish	Macdonald,
Ayres	Fisher	Mass.
Barrett	Flood	MacGregor
Beall, Md.	Flowers	Madden
Belcher	Flynt	Mahon
Bennett	Ford, Gerald R.	Maillard
Berry	Ford,	Mann
Betts	William D.	Marsh
Bevill	Foreman	Martin
Biaggi	Fountain	Matsunaga
Biester	Fraser	May
Bingham	Frelinghuysen	Mayne
Blanton	Frey	Meeds
Boggs	Friedel	Meskill
Boland	Fuqua	Michel
Bolling	Galifianakis	Mikva
Brademas	Gallagher	Miller, Calif.
Brasco	Garmatz	Miller, Ohio
Bray	Gaydos	Mills
Brinkley	Gettys	Minish
Brock	Gialmo	Mink
Brooks	Gibbons	Minshall
Broomfield	Gilbert	Mize
Brotzman	Goldwater	Mizell
Brown, Calif.	Gonzalez	Monagan
Brown, Mich.	Goodling	Montgomery
Brown, Ohio	Green, Oreg.	Moorhead
Broyhill, N.C.	Green, Pa.	Morgan
Broyhill, Va.	Griffin	Morse
Buchanan	Gross	Mosher
Burke, Fla.	Gubser	Moss
Burke, Mass.	Gude	Murphy, Ill.
Burlison, Mo.	Hagan	Myers
Burton, Calif.	Haley	Natcher
Bush	Hall	Nedzi
Byrne, Pa.	Halpern	Nelsen
Byrnes, Wis.	Hamilton	Nichols
Cabell	Hanley	Nix
Caffery	Hanna	Obey
Camp	Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara
Carter	Hansen, Wash.	O'Konski
Casey	Harsha	Olsen
Cederberg	Harvey	O'Neal, Ga.
Chamberlain	Hastings	O'Neill, Mass.
Chappell	Hathaway	Ottinger
Chisholm	Hawkins	Patman
Clancy	Hays	Patten
Clark	Hechler, W. Va.	Pelly
Clausen,	Heckler, Mass.	Pepper
Don H.	Henderson	Perkins
Clawson, Del.	Hicks	Philbin
Clay	Hogan	Pickle
Cleveland	Horton	Pike
Cohelan	Hosmer	Pirnie
Collier	Howard	Poage
Collins	Hull	Poff
Colmer	Hungate	Pollock
Conte	Hunt	Preyer, N.C.
Conyers	Hutchinson	Price, Ill.
Corbett	Ichord	Price, Tex.
Corman	Jacobs	Pryor, Ark.
Coughlin	Jarman	Pucinski
Cowder	Joelson	Purcell
Cramer	Johnson, Calif.	Quie
Culver	Johnson, Pa.	Quillen
Cunningham	Jonas	Railsback
Daddario	Jones, Ala.	Randall
Daniel, Va.	Jones, N.C.	Rarick
Daniels, N.J.	Jones, Tenn.	Rees
Davis, Ga.	Karth	Reid, Ill.
Davis, Wis.	Kastenmeier	Reid, N.Y.
de la Garza	Kazen	Reifel
Delaney	Kee	Reuss
Dellenback	Keith	Rhodes
Denney	King	Riegle
Dennis	Kleppe	Rivers
Dent	Kluczynski	Roberts
Derwinski	Koch	Robison
Devine	Kuykendall	Rodino
Dickinson	Kyl	Rogers, Colo.
Dingell	Kyros	Rogers, Fla.
Donohue	Landgrebe	Rooney, N.Y.
Dorn	Landrum	Rooney, Pa.
Dowdy	Langen	Rosenthal
Downing	Latta	Rostenkowski
Dulski	Leggett	Roth
Duncan	Lennon	Roudebush

Roybal
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Wis.

Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts

Weicker
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Winn
Wold
Wolf
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wyle
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwack

NAYS—2

Teague, Calif.

NOT VOTING—48

Abernethy	Diggs	Mollohan
Anderson,	Edwards, La.	Morton
Tenn.	Foley	Murphy, N.Y.
Baring	Fulton, Pa.	Passman
Bates	Fulton, Tenn.	Pettis
Bell, Calif.	Gray	Podell
Blackburn	Grover	Powell
Blatnik	Hammer-	Ronan
Bow	schmidt	Rumsfeld
Burleson, Tex.	Hébert	Ruppe
Burton, Utah	Helstoski	Saylor
Button	Holifield	Scheuer
Cahill	Kirwan	Smith, N.Y.
Carey	Lowenstein	Steiger, Ariz.
Celler	Lujan	Sullivan
Conable	McClure	
Dawson	Mathias	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Bell of California.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Burleson of Texas with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Button.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Hamerschmidt.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Lowenstein with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Diggs.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 51 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 53 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM UNITED STATES-CANADIAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

MAY 5, 1969.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with deep regret that I find I must resign my position on the United States-Canadian Interparliamentary Conference.

I want to thank you for your kindness in appointing me to this conference. My participation on it during the last ten years has been a most enriching experience. The United States and Canada have many common interests and goals. It was my privilege to have had the opportunity to work closely with this Conference which aims at fostering trust and cooperation between our two countries.

With best regards, I remain

Sincerely,

WILLIAM T. MURPHY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MORGAN, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

AMENDMENT OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce a new Fair Labor Standards Act.

This is necessary because Congress has failed to follow suggestions, made by some of us, to put the fair labor standards on an escalating rate of increase tied to Federal pay raises and cost-of-living index.

This morning's paper carried a story out of the White House entitled "\$4½ Billion Pay Increase for the Jobless." It does seem reasonable, Mr. Speaker, if we recognize the need to raise the income for the jobless, then workers that have to work for the minimum wage must be given consideration, by this Congress, for increased income.

The White House, in April, announced that the living cost increase was the highest in 18 years. The last cost-of-living increase since the Korean war in 1951 took place in March of this year. It cost \$12.56 in March to buy what \$10 bought in the 1957-59 period. The substantial rise in cost of living was for food, clothing, and gas, three of the daily con-

sumer items necessary for the people's health and welfare.

During the first 3 months of this year the consumer prices rose 1.5 percent, the sharpest rate of advance for any 3-month period since May-July of 1966. The index now stands 5.1 percent above a year ago. In the face of this, as well as, the President's message to Congress calling for a \$3,500 tax exemption for a family of four, it makes a new Fair Labor Standards Act, by this Congress, essential and compelling.

In order that there be no question in the minds of any Members, as to the extent of these changes, I present to you the background on fair labor standards, and a summary of the bill being introduced.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, Democrat of New Jersey, who heads up the counterpart committee in the Senate will be introducing this bill at the same time.

I want to add the contents of a release issued yesterday by AFL-CIO in a conference held in the Capitol by leaders of labor, Senator WILLIAMS, and myself.

The Gallup poll for April 17 made the following revelation on weekly living cost:

By personal assessment of living costs, the typical American figures it now costs \$72 more per week to get along that it did 32 years ago.

The median average amount that the non-farm public believes is the minimum that a family of four needs to get along today is \$102.

In 1937, when this index was first started, \$30 was the median average amount specified.

Non-farm persons whose family income is more than \$10,000 per year say that \$126 weekly is the minimum amount needed. Those whose incomes are \$3000 per year or less cite \$99 as the minimum figure, which when projected to one year, exceeds their present earnings by at least \$2000 per year.

A national sample of 1510 Americans representing all income levels in the proper proportion, was asked this question: "What is the smallest amount of money a family of four (husband, wife, and two children) need each week to get along in this community?"

Following are the highlights of the 32-year trend on this question:

	Amount per week
1937-----	\$30
1947-----	43
1957-----	72
1967-----	101
Today-----	102

Mr. Speaker, even a \$2 an hour minimum wage, as proposed, will not give the family of four the amount that the public feels it should have to satisfy its needs, but it will help. It will give the head of the family, regardless of the size, some justice. For these reasons I believe the Congress should act on the new proposed amendments as expeditiously as possible.

The release referred to follows:

BACKGROUND PAPER ON FAIR LABOR STANDARDS, 1969

The major purpose of the Fair Labor Standards Act as outlined in its Declaration of Policy is to "correct and as rapidly as practicable to eliminate the conditions," "detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers."

To fulfill the intent of FLSA it has been necessary to increase the floor under wages as the costs of "living necessary for health, efficiency and general well-being of workers"

increases over time. Such an increase is necessary today—for all workers.

For too long the Minimum Wage and Hour law excluded millions of working men and women. There are today, over 13 million workers denied the protection of minimum wage coverage—the law must be extended to as many of these possible to afford workers protection from poverty wages.

This bill would add to the law's protection nearly 13 million additional workers, employed as household domestics, or in establishments now exempt because of dollar sales volume restrictions, or other special exemptions, or because of employment by state or local governments. Many of these workers are among the poorest paid and most exploited in our society.

The "working poor" in our country number 2 million. These are the working fathers and mothers of millions of children who are either denied coverage under FLSA or are making the present below-poverty minimum wage of \$1.60 an hour. The working poor need help two ways.

First, they need to be covered and secondly, they need a statutory wage rate that will provide their families and their working efforts with something more than poverty.

The responsibility of providing a "living wage" to workers lies not with the taxpayers but with the employers who benefit from the productivity of their employees. The "working poor" are not the old, lame, and unmarried mothers who require public assistance, but the able-bodied working men and women who contribute to the profits of many companies.

What do the working poor need?

Updating the 1966 poverty line figure for price increases and the increased tax burden shows that a family of four needs almost \$4,000 a year. Thus, workers need \$2 an hour immediately.

This bill would provide for an immediate increase to \$2 an hour for all workers currently at a \$1.60 minimum wage. For workers covered initially by the 1966 amendments, the step-ups in the minimum to \$1.60 are maintained with their minimum going to \$2 in 1972. Newly covered workers would be on the same step-ups as those initially covered in 1966.

In addition to the increase in coverage and the increased statutory rate necessary to protect "the well-being of workers," it also becomes necessary to ensure that workers not be exploited by long working hours on a daily basis. Presently, most workers are guaranteed time and a half for weekly hours over 40. But the hardships of working over 8 hours in a single day are such that employees also need protection from those employers who would demand long working hours out of convenience to themselves. This bill provides a premium rate of time and a half for all hours worked over 8 in a single day.

SUMMARY OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS, 1969

Following are major provisions in the 1969 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act:

The bill would raise the minimum wage to \$2 per hour and broaden coverage to 13 million workers now excluded from protection:

MINIMUM WAGE

1.—Increase the minimum wage from \$1.60 an hour to \$2 an hour immediately for those covered before 1966.

2.—Raise the minimum wage in steps to \$2 an hour effective February 1, 1972, for those newly covered in 1966.

3.—Make farm workers equal to all other workers newly covered in 1966.

4.—Cover domestic, federal, state and local government workers and employees of small retail and service businesses on the same step-ups as those newly covered in 1966.

5.—Increase Puerto Rican and Virgin Islands workers' wages by a sum equal to those of other workers.

6.—Raise those covered by wage boards and non-appropriated funds to \$2 an hour immediately.

7.—Eliminate clauses excluding employees of linen supply houses from full coverage.

MAXIMUM HOURS

1.—Pay overtime after 8 hours in a day as well as 40 hours in a week.

2.—Bring all workers under the overtime provisions.

3.—Eliminate special maximum hour exemptions for agricultural processing workers and hospital workers.

EXEMPTIONS

Eliminate all special minimum wage, maximum hours exemptions which exclude any or all of the following groups of workers from protection: retail and service; seasonal amusement and recreational; motion picture, logging, farm, railroad, pipeline and air carrier workers, fish processors, transit workers, hotel, motel, restaurant and nursing home workers; motor vehicle partsmen, cotton ginning workers; taxi drivers, catering employees and bowling establishment workers.

CHILD LABOR

Increase the age limit for children employed in hazardous farm work to 18, the present age limit for other hazardous work. Restrict the employment of children on farms outside school hours.

ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

1.—Penalize cheating employers by permitting the Secretary of Labor to sue for unpaid minimum wages or overtime compensation and to collect liquidated damages, as well as such unpaid minimum wages as overtime compensation, in such suits.

2.—Repeal the provisions which permit tips to be offset against the minimum wage.

STATEMENT BY ANDREW J. BIEMILLER— AFL-CIO

AFL-CIO Legislative Director Andrew J. Biemiller today issued the following statement as a top AFL-CIO delegation met with Senator Harrison Williams (D.-N.J.) and Congressman John Dent (D.-Pa.), authors of bills to be introduced in both Houses to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act:

The AFL-CIO, which has declared its determination to wage a major drive to improve the Fair Labor Standards Act, is delighted today to publicly salute Senator Williams and Congressman Dent.

The measures which they will sponsor in their respective Houses fully meet the test of our time. They are well-constructed legislative vehicles designed to fulfill the humanitarian goal of the Fair Labor Standards Act by bringing it up to date and making it all-inclusive. Equally important, these are achievable bills, carefully drafted to do precisely what should be done in America—eliminate the economic problem symbolized by "the working poor".

Time and again we in the AFL-CIO have called the Fair Labor Standards Act the nation's best weapon against poverty. A decent job at a decent wage level is the answer to poverty and that we intend to achieve in America.

To Senator Williams and Congressman Dent, I extend the AFL-CIO's heartfelt thanks for sponsoring these measures and our pledge to wage a successful fight for their adoption.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO LAUDS FRANK N. CATRAMBONE ON REACHING HIS 75TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1969, my very dear and old friend,

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5554

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 8, 1969

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

AN ACT

To provide a special milk program for children.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended
4 to read as follows:

5 “SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated
6 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for each suc-
7 ceeding fiscal year, not to exceed \$125,000,000, to enable
8 the Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules and regulations
9 as he may deem in the public interest, to encourage con-
10 sumption of fluid milk by children in the United States in
11 (1) nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, and

1 (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement
2 houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions
3 devoted to the care and training of children. For the purposes
4 of this section 'United States' means the fifty States, Guam,
5 and the District of Columbia. The Secretary shall administer
6 the special milk program provided for by this section to the
7 maximum extent practicable in the same manner as he ad-
8 ministered the special milk program provided for by Public
9 Law 89-642, as amended, during the fiscal year ending
10 June 30, 1969."

Passed the House of Representatives May 6, 1969.

Attest:

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5554

AN ACT

To provide a special milk program for children.

MAY 8, 1969

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

June
8

1970

June
9

1970

June
11

1970

May
6

1970

22

1970

May
11

1970

23

1970

June
24June
24

1970

25

1970

June
27June
27

1970

10

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of May 6, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 72

CONTENTS

Child safety.....6	Horses.....11	Personnel.....2,15,18
Economics.....12	Housing.....9	Pollution.....10
Electrification.....7	Import duties.....2	Property.....14
Environment.....10	Interest.....1	Reclamation.....7,21
Farm payments.....8	Lands.....14	Recreation.....7,19
Federal aid.....20	Loans.....1	Subsidies.....8
Fees and charges.....3	Marketing orders.....5	Taxation.....2
Food labeling.....4	Meat inspection.....13,17	Textile imports.....16
Guam.....5	Milk.....5	Working capital fund.....2
Health benefits.....15,18		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported special milk program bill. Senate committee reported bill to authorize production research under marketing agreements and orders. Sen. Smith, Ill., favored ceiling of \$20,000 subsidy payments per producer.

HOUSE

1. LOANS; INTEREST. The Ways and Means Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 15979 amended, to provide that the interest on certain insured loans sold out of the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund shall be included in gross income. p. D451
2. IMPORT DUTIES; TAXATION; WORKING CAPITAL FUND. The Ways and Means Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 2076 amended, relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; H. R. 8512 amended, to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on L-Dopa; H. R. 10517 amended, to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to distilled spirits; H. R. 14720, to continue until the close of June 20, 1973, the existing suspension of duties

on manganese ores (including ferruginous ore); H. R. 17241, to continue until the close of June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duties on certain forms of copper; H. R. 9183 amended, to amend the Tariff Schedules of the U. S. to provide that imported articles which are exported and thereafter reimported to the U. S. for failure to meet sample or specifications shall, in certain instances, be entered free of duty upon such reimportation; and H. R. 16199, to establish a working capital fund for the Dept. of the Treasury. p. D451

3. FEES AND CHARGES. The conferees agreed to file a report on H. R. 14465, providing Federal assistance for expansion of the Nation's airports, and to amend the laws relative to the taxation of aviation facilities. p. D451
4. FOOD LABELING. Rep. Farbstein inserted an article in support of his proposed bill to require the open dating of packaged foods. pp. H3984-6

SENATE

5. MILK; MARKETING ORDERS; GUAM. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported the following bills: H. R. 5554, with amendment, to authorize funds to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage milk consumption by children (S. Rept. No. 91-842); H. R. 14810, with amendments, to provide that marketing orders and agreements provide for production research (S. Rept. No. 91-843); and S. 2991, to extend authority for an agricultural program in Guam (S. Rept. 91-844). p. S6703
6. CHILD SAFETY. The Committee on Commerce reported S. 2162, with amendments, to provide standards for child resistant packaging of hazardous substances (S. Rept. No. 91-845). p. S6703. Sen. Moss commented on purposes of this bill. pp. S6703-4
7. ELECTRIFICATION; RECREATION; RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) the following bills: S. 940 amended, to prohibit hydro-electric projects on Middle Snake River below Hells Canyon Dam; S. 2208 amended, to authorize a study concerning establishment of Lake Tahoe national seashore; and H. R. 780, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to maintain Ill. Valley division, Rogue River project, Oreg. pp. D447-8
8. FARM PAYMENTS. Sen. Smith, Ill., stated that it was time for the Federal Government to stop contributing to the trend towards bigness in agriculture and he proposed a crop subsidy limit of \$20,000 per producer. pp. S6726-8
9. HOUSING. Sen. Packwood spoke in favor of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970 and introduced reports showing the effect of the housing slow-down on employment in the Oreg. lumber industry. pp. S6729-31
10. ENVIRONMENT; POLLUTION. Sen. Moss inserted an address by the Asst. Secretary of Interior which expresses the view that the environment must be protected without discarding the economic advances associated with the use of pesticides and fertilizers. pp. S6742-4
Sen. Harris remarked that the environmental crisis would not exist had the urban community followed the lead of the farmer in conservation practices and he inserted an article "Earth Day Observed By Farmers for Years." pp. S6748-9

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM EXTENSION

MAY 6 (legislative day, MAY 5, 1970.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 5554]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 5554) to provide a special milk program for children, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill (as amended) do pass.

SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill, with the committee amendment, would extend the authority for the special milk program at the current authorization level (\$120 million) permanently. The current authority for this program expires June 30, 1970.

COST

The bill does not increase the current appropriation authorization of \$120 million annually; \$104 million was appropriated for this program for fiscal 1970.

BACKGROUND

Since 1954, the Department of Agriculture has operated a special milk program designed to encourage increased milk consumption by children. The program also helps maintain a healthy fluid milk dairy economy by expanding the market for fluid milk.

From fiscal year 1955 through fiscal year 1962, the program was financed through advances from Commodity Credit Corporation funds. The Agricultural Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-128), approved August 8, 1961, authorized an appropriation for the program and extended it through June 30, 1967. The Child Nutrition Act of 1966

incorporated the special milk program and extended it through fiscal year 1970.

In 1954, only nonprofit schools of high school grade and under were eligible for participation in the program; since that time, the program has been expanded to include nonprofit child care institutions such as nursery schools, summer camps, and settlement houses. Generally speaking, any institution which has been declared tax exempt by the Internal Revenue Service is eligible for the program.

Nationally, the special milk program is administered by the Child Nutrition Division, Food and Nutrition Service, of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, under provisions of section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. Locally, the program is administered in all public schools within a State by the State educational agency. In many States, this same agency also administers the program in nonprofit private schools and child care institutions. A number of States are prohibited by State statutes from administering the program in eligible nonprofit private schools and institutions. In such States the Food and Nutrition Service administers the program directly through agreements with these schools and institutions. The Food and Nutrition Service also administers the program in outlets for which no State agency has assumed administrative responsibility.

Through fiscal year 1967, based upon available funds and prior year participation, letters of credit were issued to each State agency authorizing funds for the first half of the year. These letters were later revised to authorize additional funds as needed for the remainder of the year. In order to keep expenditures within the amounts available, reimbursements to participating outlets were discounted through January 31, 1967.

Beginning in fiscal year 1968, available funds were apportioned among the States on the basis of payments made to schools and child care institutions for program reimbursement during the preceding year. Each State agency is advised of the amount of funds available to it for program reimbursement during the entire fiscal year.

The letter of credit procedure, established in 1965, permits State agencies to obtain funds to pay claims on hand by filing appropriate documents, through normal banking channels, with the Federal Reserve banks. This assures that funds will be available to the States for prompt payment of claims, and insures that Federal funds will be withdrawn from the Treasury only as needed by the States for payment of claims. No Federal funds are used by the State agencies for administering this program in the States.

From fiscal years 1955 to 1969, the number of outlets participating in the program has more than doubled and the number of half pints served has increased more than six times.

During the first year of program operation, 41,094 schools served approximately 449.8 million half pints of milk.

In fiscal 1969, 99,085 schools and child care institutions served an estimated 2,903.9 million half pints of milk. Of these, 90,272 were schools and 8,813 child care institutions.

PROGRAM STATISTICS BY FISCAL YEARS

Fiscal year	Number of outlets participating	Half-pints reimbursed (millions)	Number of children participating (millions) ¹	Total reimbursement payments
1955.....	41,094	449.8	2.5	\$17,220,281
1956.....	62,266	1,394.2	7.7	45,842,194
1957.....	71,239	1,752.7	9.7	60,411,200
1958.....	76,478	1,918.2	10.7	66,290,970
1959.....	81,587	2,176.2	12.1	74,223,939
1960.....	83,922	2,384.7	13.2	80,277,086
1961.....	86,494	2,476.7	13.8	84,008,164
1962.....	88,188	2,631.0	14.6	88,713,265
1963.....	90,486	2,765.6	15.4	93,347,465
1964.....	91,890	2,929.0	16.3	99,156,543
1965.....	92,005	2,966.8	16.5	97,268,651
1966.....	97,437	3,059.1	17.0	96,025,736
1967.....	95,139	3,027.2	17.0	98,772,872
1968.....	94,422	3,035.7	17.0	101,936,228
1969.....	99,085	2,903.9	17.0	102,048,078
1970 (estimate).....	99,100	3,000.0	17.0	103,314,000

¹ Estimated on basis of 180 school days per year

Nutritionists have long contended that children of school age need a minimum of 1 quart of milk per day to insure sufficient calcium intake. Available statistics clearly demonstrate that these needs are not fulfilled especially with respect to children of low-income areas. The special milk program has made good inroads toward correcting this deficiency. As early as 1960 a study conducted by the Department of Agriculture revealed that:

The effect of the special milk program on consumption was especially pronounced in low-income areas. In these low-income areas per capita intake of whole milk during the survey period averaged nearly 4 ounces more for children attending special milk program schools than for those attending other schools. The 4-ounce average represented rural and urban areas combined; the difference between low-income urban schools under the special milk program and those not under the program was even larger. The impact of the special milk program was smaller in schools serving medium-income areas. Children in high-income areas drank milk at about the same rate whether or not their schools participated in the special milk program. Also, children from high-income areas attending special milk program schools drank nearly one-fifth again as much milk, and those attending other schools drank almost half again as much as children from low-income areas.

Progress continues to be made under the special milk program—since 1960 the number of students served has increased by one-third, from 13 to 17 million, and the number of participating outlets has been increased by nearly 15 percent.

The above conclusions are further strengthened by the fact that, in many instances, the only whole fluid milk which many of our school-age children receive is through the special milk program.

The special milk program has had the dual effect of encouraging increased consumption of milk by 17 million children as a nutritional measure and reducing purchases of dairy products by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Historically, dairy commodity programs under

CCC have diverted between 4 and 5 percent of the Nation's milk production, and it therefore follows that eliminating the appropriation necessary for continuation of the special milk program in the interest of economy is a specious contention.

No imported milk or milk products are utilized in this program.

The volume of milk consumed under the program in 1969 amounted to more than 3 percent of the total nonfarm consumption of fluid milk. This was in addition to more than 3.3 billion half pints used in national school lunch program type A lunches; i.e., lunches which include a serving of milk and which meet certain other nutritional requirements.

Each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia are currently participating in the program. The following table reports by State the number of outlets participating, number of half pints reimbursed, and obligations for 1968 and 1969:

NUMBER OF PARTICIPATING OUTLETS HALF-PINTS REIMBURSED, AND OBLIGATIONS BY STATE—FISCAL YEARS 1968 AND 1969

State	Number of outlets participating		Estimated number half pints milk reimbursed (millions)		Obligations (thousands)	
	1968	1969	1968	1969	1968	1969
Alabama.....	1,552	1,690	47.1	50.9	\$1,603	\$1,898
Alaska.....	87	100	1.4	1.4	29	29
Arizona.....	675	776	15.4	15.2	462	414
Arkansas.....	1,031	1,070	28.7	28.8	1,104	1,113
California.....	8,026	8,220	292.5	283.8	9,276	8,982
Colorado.....	1,204	1,300	26.9	25.9	941	944
Connecticut.....	1,394	1,466	55.8	55.1	1,698	1,766
Delaware.....	242	244	10.3	10.7	363	384
District of Columbia.....	233	236	15.7	15.0	581	615
Florida.....	1,788	2,050	66.5	69.2	1,994	1,967
Georgia.....	1,693	1,993	39.6	39.5	1,570	1,683
Hawaii.....	274	277	5.6	4.5	199	157
Idaho.....	590	599	6.4	6.0	191	188
Illinois.....	4,854	4,792	246.7	191.4	6,638	6,655
Indiana.....	2,593	2,649	81.6	81.7	2,908	2,951
Iowa.....	2,185	2,172	49.4	47.9	1,851	1,808
Kansas.....	1,857	1,944	33.7	32.2	1,167	1,097
Kentucky.....	1,309	1,934	47.1	50.7	1,831	2,000
Louisiana.....	1,319	1,395	18.7	19.8	685	705
Maine.....	955	995	14.9	14.6	505	506
Maryland.....	1,468	1,514	67.6	69.5	2,233	2,441
Massachusetts.....	2,994	3,085	109.4	106.2	3,567	3,518
Michigan.....	4,462	4,775	168.1	160.9	5,692	5,076
Minnesota.....	2,517	2,716	74.3	68.6	2,659	2,698
Mississippi.....	1,058	1,211	37.0	38.8	1,364	1,393
Missouri.....	2,897	2,939	62.5	64.8	2,310	2,388
Montana.....	429	446	6.3	6.1	202	204
Nebraska.....	998	1,078	17.9	17.3	638	639
Nevada.....	221	219	5.5	5.7	152	150
New Hampshire.....	559	583	15.5	15.6	508	530
New Jersey.....	2,622	2,712	119.3	112.1	3,902	3,761
New Mexico.....	713	749	28.9	26.6	754	728
New York.....	6,369	6,797	269.6	261.0	9,395	9,250
North Carolina.....	1,786	2,266	81.1	83.5	3,758	3,543
North Dakota.....	535	557	11.2	9.7	392	357
Ohio.....	5,170	4,995	198.5	198.4	6,557	6,653
Oklahoma.....	1,521	1,466	32.4	36.8	1,045	1,118
Oregon.....	1,342	1,369	21.7	20.8	647	614
Pennsylvania.....	5,829	5,698	156.6	129.4	5,271	5,058
Rhode Island.....	370	388	15.1	13.9	425	508
South Carolina.....	1,225	1,290	18.4	18.2	632	641
South Dakota.....	511	429	11.4	10.3	368	362
Tennessee.....	1,972	1,851	52.7	45.0	1,829	1,928
Texas.....	3,426	4,166	107.2	115.2	3,732	4,121
Utah.....	591	613	10.5	9.5	358	341
Vermont.....	421	524	7.7	7.5	252	266
Virginia.....	1,801	2,031	54.8	44.3	1,828	1,984
Washington.....	1,811	1,860	44.0	42.4	1,507	1,445
West Virginia.....	1,205	1,212	16.9	16.2	618	668
Wisconsin.....	3,526	3,419	106.1	102.6	3,627	3,684
Wyoming.....	212	225	3.5	2.7	118	119
Total.....	94,422	99,085	3,035.7	2,903.9	101,996	102,048

DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS

The Department of Agriculture favors replacement of this program with a more complete meal service. Congress has recently enacted legislation to improve our school lunch and other child feeding programs. However, equipment, funding, and other problems will delay attainment of the complete meal service objective. In the meantime we should not abandon a program which has worked well. The Department's report is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., September 18, 1969.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of May 9 requesting a report on H.R. 5554, a bill, to provide a special milk program for children.

The Department does not favor enactment of this bill.

As part of the budget review process, thorough consideration was given to all the food assistance programs and the most effective allocation of available resources to improve the nutritional status of our children and our low-income families. The President has recommended that \$20 million be requested for a milk program in fiscal year 1970—an increase of \$10 million over the amount requested by the previous administration.

With this level of funding, we will be in a position to continue a milk program in schools now without a food service until such time as these schools are able to offer a complete meal service that includes a half pint of milk. We will also be able to continue a milk program in nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children.

The revised budget carries a request for a substantially higher level of funding for complete meals served in low-income area schools. We believe disadvantaged children need a complete meal that will meet a major part of their daily nutritional requirements and we plan to concentrate our efforts and our attention on reaching children with a complete breakfast and/or a complete lunch.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
Secretary of Agriculture.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted

is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

* * * * *

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending **June 30, 1967**, not to exceed \$110,000,000; for the fiscal year ending **June 30, 1968**, not to exceed \$115,000,000; and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years not to exceed \$120,000,000 *June 30, 1970, and for each succeeding fiscal year, not to exceed \$120,000,000* to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules and regulations as he may deem in the public interest, to encourage consumption of fluid milk by children in the United States in (1) non-profit schools of high school grade and under, and (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. For the purposes of this section "United States" means the fifty States and the District of Columbia. The Secretary shall administer the special milk program provided for by this section to the maximum extent practicable in the same manner as he administered the special milk program provided for by Public Law **[85-478]** *89-642*, as amended, during the fiscal year ended June 30, **[1966]** *1969*.

* * * * *



Calendar No. 845

91ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 5554

[Report No. 91-842]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 8, 1969

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

MAY 6 (legislative day, MAY 5), 1970

Reported by Mr. AIKEN, with an amendment

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

To provide a special milk program for children.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended
4 to read as follows:

5 “SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated
6 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for each suc-
7 ceeding fiscal year, not to exceed ~~\$125,000,000~~ \$120,000,-
8 000, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules
9 and regulations as he may deem in the public interest, to
10 encourage consumption of fluid milk by children in the

AN ACT

To provide a special milk program for children.

MAY 8, 1969

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

MAY 6 (legislative day, MAY 5), 1970

Reported with an amendment

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of May 11, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 74

CONTENTS

Animal quarantine.....29	Foreign currencies.....8	Pollution.....5,16,20
Appropriations.....1,17	Foreign trade.....26	Recess.....10
Coffee.....4	Forests.....7	Reclamation.....28
Consumer.....15	Guam.....12	Recreation.....13
Credit unions.....22	Hazardous substances...12	Reorganization.....2
Dairy.....11	Health.....25	Social security.....9
Economy.....14	Housing.....23	Special milk.....11
Employment.....14,27	Lands.....7	Subsidies.....18
Environment.....5,16,20	Marketing orders.....11	Taxation.....24
Farmers.....6	Mining.....28	Tobacco.....3
Farm payments.....18	Opinion poll.....19	Water resources.....21

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed special milk program bill; bill to authorize production research under marketing agreements and orders; bill to authorize agricultural program in Guam. House committee reported tobacco marketing quota bill. House committee reported resolution to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 2.

HOUSE

- 1. APPROPRIATIONS.** The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 17548, making appropriations for sundry executive agencies and HUD, p. H4208
Passed H. R. 16595, to authorize National Science Foundation's appropriations. pp. H4140-63
- 2. REORGANIZATION.** The Government Operations Committee reported H. Res. 960, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 (involving changes in the Budget Bureau) (H. Rept. No. 91-1066). p. H4209

3. TOBACCO. The Agriculture Committee reported H. R. 14306, to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the AAA Act of 1938 (H. Rept. No. 91-1069). p. H4209
 4. COFFEE. Both Houses received the 1969 report on the operations of the International Coffee Agreement. p. H4105. Rep. Gross expressed dissatisfaction with the accomplishments of the agreement. p. H4105, S6875
 5. ENVIRONMENT. Rep. Hamilton urged establishment of a Jt. Committee on Environment and Technology. pp. H4176-7
 6. FARMERS. Rep. Alexander urged development of legislation that "deals effectively with the cost-price squeeze" facing today's "farm minority." pp. H4187-8
 7. LANDS; FORESTS. Both Houses received notification from the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Army to interchange jurisdiction of civil works and forest lands at Monroe Reservoir and Cannelton locks, Ind. pp. H4208, S6909
 8. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. Both Houses received a report from Export Marketing Service on agreements signed for foreign currencies under P. L. 480 during Mar. and Apr. 1970. pp. H4208, S6909
 9. SOCIAL SECURITY. The Ways and Means Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 17550, proposed Social Security Amendments of 1970. p. D464
 10. RECESS. The House will recess from COB Wed., May 27 until noon Mon., June 1 for Memorial Day, and from COB Wed., July 1 until noon Mon., July 6 for Independence Day. p. H4105
- SENATE
-
11. SPECIAL MILK; MARKETING ORDERS. Passed with amendment H. R. 5554, to authorize funds to encourage milk consumption by children; and H. R. 14810, to provide that marketing orders contain terms which establish and provide for production research. pp. S6876-7, S6877-8
 12. GUAM; HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES. Passed without amendment S. 2991, to extend the authority for an agricultural program in Guam; and with amendment, S. 2162, to authorize the establishment of standards for the child-resistant packaging of hazardous substances. pp. S6876-880, S6886-8
 13. RECREATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment S. 2208, to study the desirability of a national lakeshore on Lake Tahoe (S. Rept. No. 91-855). p. S6905
 14. ECONOMY; UNEMPLOYMENT. Sen. Javits stated that the war on inflation is being badly handled and he submitted proposals to affect the rise in unemployment, with especial emphasis on the disadvantaged youth aged 14-21. pp. S6898-6900
 15. CONSUMER. Sen. Moss spoke of the need for more consumer legislation and inserted a newspaper article reporting the first year success of Presidential Consumer Adviser Knauer. pp. S6919-20



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 116

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 11, 1970

No. 74

Senate

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who has made and preserved us a nation, above the turmoil and turbulence of the world without, we pause in this Chamber to acknowledge that Thou art God forever and ever. Our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded. In days heavy with crisis be to us our shield, our strength, and our guide.

Open our eyes to the vision of Thy coming kingdom of justice and righteousness among all men and nations.

O Lord, bless Thy servants in the ministry of public affairs who serve Thee in this Chamber. Give them quiet minds and hearts that they may hear Thy voice. Help them to know when to speak, when to be silent, when to pray, when to work, and when to rest. Give them grace to contend without being contentious; to disagree without being disagreeable. Give them strength to oppose the wrong and to uphold the right. And when the evening comes may they have a good conscience and a soul at peace with Thee and with one another.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read a communication to the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, a Senator from the State of South Carolina to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HOLLINGS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT—SEPARATE AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (EXECUTIVE REPT. NO. 91-18)

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 7, 1970, Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, on May 9, 1970, submitted an executive report on the nomination of Harry A. Blackmun, of Minnesota, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, together with the separate views of Senators BAYH, GRIFFIN, HART, KENNEDY, and TYDINGS, and the individual views of Senators HART, BAYH, BYRD of West Virginia, and MATHIAS, which report was printed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 6, 1970:

S. 1963. An act for the relief of Wu Hip; and

S. 2306. An act to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes.

On May 7, 1970:

S. 533. An act for the relief of Barbara Rogerson Marmor;

S. 1177. An act to authorize the documentation of the vessel West Wind as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges; and

S. 1775. An act for the relief of Cora S. Villaruel.

REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT, 1968—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGS) laid before the Sen-

ate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith my 1969 report on the operations of the International Coffee Agreements, 1968.

This treaty, which continues in modified form the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, embodies the oft-stated concern of the United States that the developing countries dependent on the export of primary commodities be able to achieve the stability in foreign exchange income essential for economic growth. The International Coffee Agreement, which involves the most important agricultural export of the less developed world, has evolved into an effective mechanism for influencing coffee prices toward levels which are equitable for producers and reasonable for consumers. While the Agreement is not designed to eliminate reasonable price fluctuations, it has been successful in 1969 as in the previous years of its existence in moderating price movements and preventing prices from reaching levels disastrously low for exporting countries or unacceptably high to the importing countries.

I am encouraged also by the progress which the Agreement has made in achieving long-term market equilibrium through the setting of production goals for the coffee year 1972-73 and the establishment of the Coffee Diversification Fund designed to bring the supply of coffee in line with demand. I hope that negotiations for United States participation in this Fund soon will be completed.

Agreement with Brazil was reached April 30, 1969, on a temporary arrangement regarding the export of soluble coffee from that country to the United States. Consultations toward a permanent solution to this problem are currently under way.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 11, 1970.

S 6875

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGS) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session, the following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works:

Brig. Gen. Harold R. Parfitt, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of passage of various bills which the joint leadership intends to call up at this time, the distinguished Senator from Ohio (Mr. Young) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 7, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to limit statements to 3 minutes in relation to routine morning business, which will be conducted after the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Ohio (Mr. Young).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider bills on the calendar, beginning with order No. 845, and the rest of the calendar, exclusive of order No. 848.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM EXTENSION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5554) to provide a special milk program for children, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "exceed", strike out "\$125,000,000" and insert "\$120,000,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-842), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COST

The bill does not increase the current appropriation authorization of \$120 million annually; \$104 million was appropriated for this program for fiscal 1970.

BACKGROUND

Since 1954, the Department of Agriculture has operated a special milk program designed to encourage increased milk consumption by children. The program also helps maintain a healthy fluid milk dairy economy by expanding the market for fluid milk.

From fiscal year 1955 through fiscal year 1962, the program was financed through advances from Commodity Credit Corporation funds. The Agricultural Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-128), approved August 8, 1961, authorized an appropriation for the program and extended it through June 30, 1967. The Child Nutrition Act of 1966 incorporated the special milk program and extended it through fiscal year 1970.

In 1954, only nonprofit schools of high school grade and under were eligible for participation in the program; since that time, the program has been expanded to include nonprofit child care institutions such as nursery schools, summer camps, and settlement houses. Generally speaking, any institution which has been declared tax exempt by the Internal Revenue Service is eligible for the program.

Nationally, the special milk program is administered by the Child Nutrition Division, Food and Nutrition Service, of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, under provisions of section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. Locally, the program is administered in all public schools within a State by the State educational agency. In many States, this same agency also administers the program in nonprofit private schools and child care institutions. A number of States are prohibited by State statutes from administering the program in eligible nonprofit private schools

and institutions. In such States the Food and Nutrition Service administers the program directly through agreements with these schools and institutions. The Food and Nutrition Service also administers the program in outlets for which no State agency has assumed administrative responsibility.

Through fiscal year 1967, based upon available funds and prior year participation, letters of credit were issued to each State agency authorizing funds for the first half of the year. These letters were later revised to authorize additional funds as needed for the remainder of the year. In order to keep expenditures within the amounts available, reimbursements to participating outlets were discounted through January 31, 1967.

Beginning in fiscal year 1968, available funds were apportioned among the States on the basis of payments made to schools and child care institutions for program reimbursement during the preceding year. Each State agency is advised of the amount of funds available to it for program reimbursement during the entire fiscal year.

The letter of credit procedure, established in 1965, permits State agencies to obtain funds to pay claims on hand by filing appropriate documents, through normal banking channels, with the Federal Reserve banks. This assures that funds will be available to the States for prompt payment of claims, and insures that Federal funds will be withdrawn from the Treasury only as needed by the States for payment of claims. No Federal funds are used by the State agencies for administering this program in the States. From fiscal years 1955 to 1969, the number of outlets participating in the program has more than doubled and the number of half pints served has increased more than six times.

During the first year of program operation, 41,094 schools served approximately 449.8 million half pints of milk.

In fiscal 1969, 99,085 schools and child care institutions served an estimated 2,903.9 million half pints of milk. Of these, 90,272 were schools and 8,813 child care institutions.

PROGRAM STATISTICS BY FISCAL YEARS

Fiscal year	Number of outlets participating	Half-pints reimbursed (millions)	Number of children participating (millions) ¹	Total reimbursement payments
1955.....	41,094	449.8	2.5	\$17,220,281
1956.....	62,266	1,394.2	7.7	45,842,194
1957.....	71,239	1,752.7	9.7	60,411,200
1958.....	76,478	1,918.2	10.7	66,290,970
1959.....	81,587	2,176.2	12.1	74,223,939
1960.....	83,922	2,384.7	13.2	80,277,086
1961.....	86,494	2,476.7	13.8	84,008,164
1962.....	88,188	2,631.0	14.6	88,713,265
1963.....	90,486	2,765.6	15.4	93,347,465
1964.....	91,890	2,929.0	16.3	99,156,543
1965.....	92,005	2,966.8	16.5	97,268,651
1966.....	97,437	3,059.1	17.0	96,025,736
1967.....	95,139	3,027.2	17.0	98,772,872
1968.....	94,422	3,035.7	17.0	101,936,228
1969.....	99,085	2,903.9	17.0	102,048,078
1970 estimate.....	99,100	3,000.0	17.0	103,314,000

¹ Estimated on basis of 180 school days per year.

Nutritionists have long contended that children of school age need a minimum of 1 quart of milk per day to insure sufficient calcium intake. Available statistics clearly demonstrate that these needs are not fulfilled especially with respect to children of low-income areas. The special milk program has made good inroads toward correcting this deficiency. As early as 1960 a study conducted by the Department of Agriculture revealed that:

The effect of the special milk program on consumption was especially pronounced in low-income areas. In these low-income areas per capita intake of whole milk during the survey period averaged nearly 4 ounces more for children attending special milk program schools than for those attending other schools. The 4-ounce average represented rural and urban areas combined; the difference between low-income urban schools under the special milk program and those not under the program was even larger. The impact of the special milk program was smaller in schools serving medium-income areas. Children in high-income areas drank milk at about the same rate whether or not their schools participated in the special milk program. Also, children from high-income areas attending special milk program schools drank nearly one-fifth again as much milk, and those attending other schools drank almost

half again as much as children from low-income areas.

Progress continues to be made under the special milk program—since 1960 the number of students served has increased by one-third, from 13 to 17 million, and the number of participating outlets has been increased by nearly 15 percent.

The above conclusions are further strengthened by the fact that, in many instances, the only whole fluid milk which many of our school-age children receive is through the special milk program.

The special milk program has had the dual effect of encouraging increased consumption of milk by 17 million children as a nutritional measure and reducing purchases of dairy products by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Historically, dairy commodity programs under CCC have diverted between 4 and 5 percent of the Nation's milk pro-

duction, and it therefore follows that eliminating the appropriation necessary for continuation of the special milk program in the interest of economy is a specious contention.

No imported milk or milk products are utilized in this program.

The volume of milk consumed under the program in 1969 amounted to more than 3 percent of the total nonfarm consumption of fluid milk. This was in addition to more than 3.3 billion half pints used in national school lunch program type A lunches; i.e., lunches which include a serving of milk and which meet certain other nutritional requirements.

Each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia are currently participating in the program. The following table reports by State the number of outlets participating, number of half pints reimbursed, and obligations for 1968 and 1969:

NUMBER OF PARTICIPATING OUTLETS HALF-PINTS REIMBURSED, AND OBLIGATIONS BY STATE—FISCAL YEARS 1968 AND 1969

State	Number of outlets participating		Estimated number half pints milk reimbursed (millions)		Obligations (thousands)	
	1968	1969	1968	1969	1968	1969
Alabama.....	1,552	1,690	47.1	50.9	\$1,603	\$1,898
Alaska.....	87	100	1.4	1.4	29	29
Arizona.....	675	776	15.4	15.2	462	414
Arkansas.....	1,031	1,070	28.7	28.8	1,104	1,113
California.....	8,026	8,220	292.5	283.8	9,276	8,982
Colorado.....	1,204	1,300	26.9	25.9	941	944
Connecticut.....	1,394	1,466	55.8	55.1	1,698	1,766
Delaware.....	242	244	10.3	10.7	363	384
District of Columbia.....	233	236	15.7	15.0	581	615
Florida.....	1,788	2,050	66.5	69.2	1,994	1,967
Georgia.....	1,693	1,993	39.6	39.5	1,570	1,683
Hawaii.....	274	277	5.6	4.5	199	157
Idaho.....	590	599	6.4	6.0	191	188
Illinois.....	4,854	4,792	246.7	191.4	6,638	6,655
Indiana.....	2,593	2,649	81.6	81.7	2,908	2,951
Iowa.....	2,185	2,172	49.4	47.9	1,851	1,808
Kansas.....	1,857	1,944	33.7	32.2	1,167	1,097
Kentucky.....	1,309	1,934	47.1	50.7	1,831	2,000
Louisiana.....	1,319	1,395	18.7	19.8	685	705
Maine.....	955	995	14.9	14.6	505	506
Maryland.....	1,468	1,514	67.6	69.5	2,233	2,441
Massachusetts.....	2,994	3,085	109.4	106.2	3,567	3,518
Michigan.....	4,462	4,775	168.1	160.9	5,692	5,076
Minnesota.....	2,517	2,716	74.3	68.6	2,659	2,698
Mississippi.....	1,058	1,211	37.0	38.8	1,364	1,393
Missouri.....	2,897	2,939	62.5	64.8	2,310	2,388
Montana.....	429	446	6.3	6.1	\$202	\$204
Nebraska.....	998	1,078	17.9	17.3	638	639
Nevada.....	221	219	5.5	5.7	152	150
New Hampshire.....	559	583	15.5	15.6	508	530
New Jersey.....	2,622	2,712	119.3	112.1	3,902	3,761
New Mexico.....	713	749	28.9	26.6	754	728
New York.....	6,369	6,797	269.6	261.0	9,395	9,250
North Carolina.....	1,786	2,266	81.1	83.5	3,758	3,543
North Dakota.....	535	557	11.2	9.7	392	357
Ohio.....	5,170	4,995	198.5	198.4	6,557	6,653
Oklahoma.....	1,521	1,466	32.4	36.8	1,045	1,118
Oregon.....	1,342	1,369	21.7	20.8	647	614
Pennsylvania.....	5,829	5,698	156.6	129.4	5,271	5,058
Rhode Island.....	370	388	15.1	13.9	425	508
South Carolina.....	1,225	1,290	18.4	18.2	632	641
South Dakota.....	511	429	11.4	10.3	368	362
Tennessee.....	1,972	1,851	52.7	45.0	1,829	1,928
Texas.....	3,426	4,166	107.2	115.2	3,732	4,121
Utah.....	591	613	10.5	9.5	358	341
Vermont.....	421	524	7.7	7.5	252	266
Virginia.....	1,801	2,031	54.8	44.3	1,828	1,984
Washington.....	1,811	1,860	44.0	42.4	1,507	1,445
West Virginia.....	1,205	1,212	16.9	16.2	618	668
Wisconsin.....	3,526	3,419	106.1	102.6	3,627	3,684
Wyoming.....	212	225	3.5	2.7	118	119
Total.....	94,422	99,085	3,035.7	2,903.9	101,996	102,048

PRODUCTION RESEARCH UNDER MARKETING AGREEMENT AND ORDER PROGRAMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 14810) to amend section 602 (3) and section 608(6) (I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to authorize production research under marketing agreement and order programs, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "the", strike out "Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 674; 50 Stat. 249)" and insert "Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation (7 U.S.C. 601; 48 Stat. 31)"; in line 9, after the word "Section", strike out "602(3)" and insert "2 (3)"; on page 2, at the beginning of line 3, strike out "608c(6) (I)" and insert "8c (6) (I)"; in line 5, after the word "section" strike out "608c(6)" and insert "8c (6)"; and in line 11, after the word "second", strike out "provision and insert "proviso".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be

engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to amend section 2(3) and section 8c(6) (I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation, so as to authorize production research under marketing agreement and order programs."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-843), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill would authorize inclusion in marketing orders for commodities other than milk of provisions for production research supported by handler assessments. It would also make such research, and marketing research and development projects as now authorized by the act, a purpose of the act. This would permit initiation and continuation of such research and development projects when prices were above parity.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee amendments make purely technical changes to correct the citations of the act and provisions being amended.

DEVELOPMENTAL VIEWS, BACKGROUND, COST, AND FURTHER EXPLANATION

The bill is further explained in the following report favoring enactment from the Department of Agriculture. The Department estimates the cost of an order amendment proceeding at \$7,500, and the annual cost of administering an order at \$25,000. A list of the fruit and vegetable marketing orders now in effect is also attached.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, July 28, 1969.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of May 14, 1969, for a report on H.R. 8536, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. The effect of this bill is to authorize research relating to the production of commodities essentially on the same basis that authority for marketing research is now provided for in 608(c) (I) of the Act. In addition, the amendment would clarify the authority contained in section 609(3), to regulate in above-parity situations, to assure that it applies to the initiation as well as continuation of marketing research and de-

velopment projects as authorized in section 608c(6) (I), and would apply to production research on the same basis.

The Department favors enactment of H.R. 8536.

GUAM AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

The bill (S. 2991) to extend the act establishing Federal agricultural services in Guam, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2991

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, Public Law 88-584, is amended by striking out "five years from the date of enactment of this Act" and inserting "June 30, 1975".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-844), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill extends through June 30, 1975, Public Law 88-584, which authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain an agricultural program in Guam until September 7, 1969. Public Law 88-584 limits the number of employees of the Department of Agriculture stationed on Guam to carry out the program to not more than three at any one time. Public Law 88-584 limits appropriations for the program to not more than \$60,000 for any year.

At present one Federal extension specialist is stationed on Guam under an agreement ending June 30, 1970. Since expiration of Public Law 88-584, the Department depends, as authority for his services to Guam, on the following rather general language of section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act:

The Federal Extension Service shall receive such additional amounts as Congress shall determine for administration, technical, and other services and for coordinating the extension work of the Department and the several States, Territories, and possessions.

Enactment of the bill would provide clear authority for continuation of this extension work in Guam and would authorize additional programs to be made available in Guam if that is desirable.

Enactment of S. 1148, which was passed by the Senate on April 15, 1970, would authorize Extension and Cooperative State Research Service activities, but would not provide for other Department of Agriculture programs in Guam as would S. 2991.

IMPROVEMENT AND CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN LAWS AFFECTING THE COAST GUARD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 13816) to improve and clarify certain laws affecting the Coast Guard which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments, on page 4, line 21, after "(b)," strike out "and (c)" and insert "(c) and (e)"; on page 5, line 11, after the word "in", strike out "which event he is authorized to exceed the authorized average." and insert "some areas, in which event he is authorized to reallocate existing funds to high-cost areas so that rental expend-

itures in such areas exceed the average authorized for the Department of Defense."; on page 6, after line 14, insert:

"(e) The authority provided in subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section shall expire on June 30, 1972'."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc; and also send an additional amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments will be considered and agreed to en bloc and, the clerk will state the additional amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 14 delete the quotation mark following the word "dependents."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-847), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to make a number of revisions in title 14, title 10, and title 37 of the United States Code for the better operation of the Coast Guard. All but a few of the revisions have the effect of aligning the law pertaining to the Coast Guard more closely with existing provisions applicable to the other Armed Forces.

Several of the provisions of the bill relate to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn. The authorized ceiling of cadets who may be appointed annually to the Academy is increased from 400 to 600. An examination of the various areas in which the Coast Guard is operating, ranging from oceanographic research to the support of the country's efforts in Southeast Asia, suggests the need for a gradual expansion in the number of Coast Guard officers. The committee anticipates that the expansion will be at a rate of approximately 25 to 30 cadets per year and that the full level authorized will not be reached before 1980.

Also in connection with the Academy, the bill provides authority to order a cadet to active duty as a member of the Coast Guard Reserve in an appropriate enlisted grade for a period not to exceed 4 years, if he does not complete his course or refuses to accept a commission. This change is desirable to give the Coast Guard a means of protecting its investment in a cadet who chooses not to fulfill the obligations he has undertaken in connection with his attendance at the Academy, and parallels similar authority granted the other Armed Forces. This authority is to protect the Government's investment and is not intended to be punitive in nature.

In that regard, the Coast Guard has expressed its intention not to require enlisted service of cadets separated before their third academic year, or for demonstrated unsuitability, unfitness or physical disqualification.

The authority contained in the bill to permit permanent commissioned teaching staff to remain until age 64 conforms to existing authority in the other armed service academies.

The bill also would authorize the promotion of ensigns to lieutenants (junior grade) after 12 months' active service, which is a practice similar to that in the Navy. Another change would remove Reserve officers assigned to the Selective Service System from the active duty promotion list, which will afford those officers opportunity for a promotion in accordance with their assigned duties. In addition, recall of retired regular officers with their consent is authorized.

The bill also makes certain changes with respect to the services provided dependents. For example, the increased activity of the Coast Guard has aggravated the problem of providing proper education facilities for dependent schoolchildren. In many cases, housing is located beyond normal travel distance and public means of transportation are not available to the children. This bill would authorize expenditures of money for transportation of the dependents where required. The expanded activity of the Coast Guard has also created a language problem with respect to dependents serving in overseas bases. To meet this problem, the bill authorizes language training for Coast Guard dependents in anticipation of assignment to permanent duty outside the United States. The other Armed Forces already have this authority.

The bill also contains provisions relating to housing and housing allowances and provides authority for procurement of leased housing and continued assignment to personnel of housing designated as inadequate for purposes of housing allowances. A more detailed explanation of the bill's provisions relating to housing appears hereafter under the title "Explanation of Amendments."

A number of years ago, the Coast Guard took over the former Lighthouse Service and with it the civilian lighthouse keepers. After the transfer to the Coast Guard, new assignments were made of Coast Guard personnel to lighthouse facilities, but a number of civilian employees still serve. Compensation of such personnel is limited to \$5,100 and this has prevented the more senior employees from receiving benefits afforded other civil service employees under pay increases during the past several years. In addition, the Bureau of the Budget has required an upward adjustment in rental charges for quarters for these employees and this will have an adverse effect on their net compensation. The increase in maximum compensation to \$7,500, as contained in this bill, will serve to protect the net pay position of these employees and to permit them to receive pay increases in accordance with those made to other civil service employees.

Other changes proposed by the bill will permit obligations to be incurred against anticipated reimbursement to the Coast Guard supply fund. The capacity of the fund has been reduced during recent years because of inflation and the need for increased inventories. The authority thus provided conforms to that presently enjoyed by the Department of Defense.

The remaining amendments to existing law include clarification of the degree of Coast Guard responsibility for underwater search and rescue; maritime safety and law enforcement; authority to provide payment for Coast Guard aviation cadets similar to that for other Armed Forces aviation cadets; authority to provide uniform allowances for enlisted members of the Coast Guard appointed to permanent warrant officer grade; an increase in the maximum pay of the permanent commissioned teaching staff at the Academy; and authority to accept not to exceed four cadets from the Republic of the Philippines at the Academy.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS

The three amendments to H.R. 13816 adopted by your committee all relate to the

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of June 16, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 99

CONTENTS

Acreage Limitation.....4	Footwear.....14	Production Research.....6
Appropriations.....11	Foreign Trade.....8,10,14	Reclamation.....4
Conservation.....18	Health.....15	Stockpile.....5
Economy.....12	Housing.....7	Textiles.....14
Fisheries.....20	Inflation.....16	Walla Walla Project.....3
Fluorspar.....5	Minerals.....10	Waste Disposal System..13
Food.....9	Pollution.....17	Wildlife.....19

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to Senate amendment to special milk program bill.
House subcommittee approved custom slaughtering bill.

HOUSE

1. MILK PROGRAM. Agreed to the Senate amendment to H. R. 5554, providing a special milk program for children. This bill now goes to the President. p. H5574
2. SLAUGHTERING. An Agriculture Committee subcommittee approved for full committee action H. R. 16485, amended, clarifying the provisions relating to custom slaughtering operations. p. D635

3. WALLA WALLA PROJECT. A conference report was filed on S. 743, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Touchet division, Walla Walla project (H. Rept. No. 91-1196). p. H5636
4. RECLAMATION. A conference report was filed on S. 2062, providing for the differentiation between private and public ownership of lands in the administration of the acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law (H. Rept. No. 91-1197). p. H5636
5. STOCKPILE. A conference report was filed on H. R. 15833, authorizing the disposal of fluorspar from the national stockpile. p. H5636
6. PRODUCTION RESEARCH. Agreed to the Senate amendments to H. R. 14810, authorizing production research under marketing agreement and order programs. This bill now goes to the President. p. H5574
7. HOUSING. The Rules Committee granted a rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 17495, increasing the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing. p. D636
Rep. Barrett inserted an article critical of the Administration's plan to increase funds available for home loans by starting to pay off the national debt. p. H5633
8. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Dorn stated there is a need to reject partisanship to "save the American textile industry from excessive unfair low-wage foreign imports". p. H5614
9. FOOD. A memorial was received from the California legislative, relative to the feeding of needy schoolchildren; to the Committee on Education and Labor. p. H5637

SENATE

10. FOREIGN TRADE; MINERALS. The Committee on Finance reported without amendment the following bills: H. R. 14956 to extend for three years the period during which certain dyeing and tanning materials may be imported free of duty (S. Rept. No. 91-931); H. R. 17241 to continue the existing suspension of duties on certain forms of copper (S. Rept. No. 91-932); and H. R. 14720 to continue the existing suspension of duties on manganese ore (S. Rept. No. 91-933). p. S9040
11. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President a proposed amendment to the Budget, 1971, to provide funds for Department of Commerce National Industrial Pollution Control Council (S. Doc. No. 91-91). p. S9040
12. ECONOMY. Sen. Javits tied the discordant economic situation to the "7-year plague of Vietnam" and submitted suggestions "toward the end of getting our economy moving". pp. S9055-59
Sen. Goldwater inserted the optimistic statement of a Univ. of Chicago economist on the state of the economy. pp. S9101-04

recognition of the heritage of American freedom.

Our real hope in America today is for national unity. National unity is paramount not only in the United States but in every democracy. Our forefathers decreed that this shall be "one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all". They further proclaimed, "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness".

There were few debunkers in those days. The school of sociological jurisprudence, with its nebulous bases and shifting norms of human wants had not as yet made its appearance to confound and confuse them. Freud had not yet appeared to tell them about their ego and their super ego. Marx, with his gospel of the economically determined man, had yet to make his appearance and Lenin was not yet on the earthly scene to proclaim, "We deny all morality taken from supernatural conceptions".

Unlike us, they not only knew what they were doing, but where they were going. They were a naive group of men, these fashioners of our American commonwealth. Free will to them was not the instinct of the herd or a mass illusion, and simple as they were, they were convinced that there was a moral order to which all man-made law must conform.

They were one with the cultural and intellectual tradition of the West, and upon that foundation they reared the structure of our American democracy.

It is our task, therefore, inherited from these founding fathers, to create on this continent, a nation of free people, strong enough to withstand tyranny and oppression; wise enough to educate our children in the ways of truth, and broad enough to accept as a self-evident truth the right of every human being to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

This country is unique in that it has from the time of its discovery been the haven of the unfortunate, the oppressed, and the persecuted. For years people of every nationality, of every religion, or every race, have willingly and freely come to our shores in search of shelter and solace from the economic, political, and religious intolerances of other governments. America, the melting pot, has welcomed them with outstretched arms. We became a great nation because of our open-hearted welcome to the outraged and oppressed. We shall remain a great nation only by protecting ourselves against those people who would destroy such tolerance. In comparison with all the other nations of the world, the United States stands preeminent. In the genius of our people, in the productivity of our soil and in the vast store of our natural resources, we possess the elements which are bound to provide a high standard of living for all the citizens of this nation. The accomplishments of the past provide us with adequate reasons for confidence in the future.

America is truly one nation with many nationalities. It is a nation dedicated to inspired principles for which people have been willing to sacrifice and suffer; a democracy of cultures as well as a free and tolerant association of individuals; a country in which there is present the values and ideas, the arts and sciences, the laws and techniques of the people of every civilized tradition.

The United States was founded by individuals of Old World nationalities who shared the common love of freedom and who were motivated by the intense desire to establish this freedom into a government for the people. It is our duty to see that this government endures and perpetuates.

The American people have always been concerned with the flagrant violations of the rights of peaceful little nations; the cruel and bitter persecution of God-fearing men,

women and children because of their religion, race or political opinions. The vile and barbarous deeds which were inflicted upon democratic peoples of the Old World represent an attack against everything that we hold dear—an attack against international good faith, against religion, against political freedom and against civilization itself.

We cry for peace, and there is no peace, for mankind, like Esau of old, has sold its birthright for a mess of pottage. We have, for the most part, repudiated the divinity of our origin and our destiny—the cultural traditions that bind us to the past. We glory in our achievements in the field of science. We possess in our libraries the accumulated wisdom of the ages, and yet, instead of ushering in Tennyson's fabled thousand years of peace, we have raised the curtain on the prelude to the very pit of hell itself.

The last world conflict was not only a struggle of armaments. It was not the revolution of a free people to determine a change in their government, but rather was it the spawn of that atheistic culture and philosophy that stemmed from Marx and Engel, the matriarch of all other "isms" that have sprung from generations of irreligion, the repudiation of fundamentals, false liberalism and the pursuit of the cult of pleasure—a conflict that not only threatened our peace but our very way of life by those who openly proclaimed that there was no God but Caesar, and that the altar of the omnipotent state was the only shrine before which every head must bow and every knee must bend.

We must relegate to oblivion all the destructive force of the many "isms" that are being promoted by those who seek to destroy our democratic institutions. We must recognize and we must fight for only one "ism", and that is Americanism.

And fight we did—for everything contained in the term "Americanism." No group of men know better than you that America assembled her full might and threw it with all her fury against mankind's enemies. The invasion of the Continent represented the hopes, the fears, and the sacrifices of millions of people whose hearts were steeled for the final encounter with the enemy. From the North, and South, the East and the West, the Nazis and their shackled minions were driven to their inevitable doom. All of the arms used in the fight against the Axis, both in Europe and in the Pacific, would not have been available had it not been for the sense of duty and fidelity which is inherent in every true American. The ships, the planes, and the guns that drove the Japs from the Solomon and Gilbert Islands, that wrested the Marianas from the control of the Orient, and that had the Jap garrisons in Truk and the Philippines quaking in fear, were the result of the average American's sense of duty to his Government and of his loyalty to democracy and his unquestionable love of freedom.

The landing craft, the invasion barges and the paratroop planes that pierced Hitler's vaunted Atlantic wall, and took Hirohito's islands, were manned by the boys of the same heritage of Bunker Hill, Ticonderoga, the Alamo, San Juan Hill and Chateau Thierry, all of whom were consumed with the burning love of liberty and were willing to give the last drop of their life's blood that the light of freedom should always burn aloft over our Republic.

I daresay that there is not a man here today who has not been affected in some way or another by the great world crisis. Whether those who were so near and dear to you fought in the foxholes of Guadalcanal, or on the desert sands of Tunisia, or on the beachheads of Italy, or on Iwo Jima, on Tarawa, at Bataan or on Wake Island—remember this—they had had a rendez-vous with death, and yet despite all, the final victory was ours. Is it any wonder then that America's duty to the future demands that

the cherished principles of liberty be preserved for all time? We can do this best by striking at the forces which assail liberty—the thoughtless and the exponents of totalitarian serfdom and slavery. The American people have always been concerned with the flagrant violations of peaceful little nations; the cruel and bitter persecution of God-fearing men, women and children, because of their religion, race or political opinions. The vile and barbarous deeds which have been inflicted upon democratic peoples of the Old World represent an attack against everything we hold dear—an attack against international good faith, against religion, against political freedom and against civilization itself.

If the people of this country have no convictions with regard to the values in which they so strongly believe, no faith in the principles for which their fathers and forefathers died, democracy then is doomed. If Americans will not voluntarily obey the disciplines of morality, then immoral forces will discipline us. And if the citizens of the United States have no ideals for which they would die to preserve, then despotism and darkness will come over the western hemisphere, just as it threatens to envelop Europe and the rest of the world. The salvation of this nation, therefore, lies in the full-hearted allegiance of every American to the self-evident truths contained in the Declaration of Independence and the liberties protected by the Bill of Rights.

The great problem in America today, as it has always been in the past, is how people with important differences and conflicting viewpoints in the realms of religion and politics can live together in harmony. The solution of this problem, perhaps, is America's destiny, and in that solution may lie her future as a nation. Since America is a medley of differences, engendered by the existence within her borders of more than a score of nationalities and an infinite number of religions, those differences must find one common denominator—one level, and that is, understanding. Understand others' views and appreciate them. It is not so much tolerance which is needed, as appreciation—an appreciation of the rights of others which all humans possess, because freedom of thought and conscience is not a matter of favor granted by the state and withheld by the state, or granted by the majority and withdrawn by the majority, but it is a matter of right, inalienable, God-given and self-evident.

We can thank God that our forebears came to America. They had something to do and they felt they knew how to do it. They had the job of clearing and plowing the land and making themselves and their families safe from the Indians. They had the job of tying together with slips and roads and rails and words and names a large area of undeveloped land into a single social unit. They knew who they were. They were the smartest, toughest, leanest, all-around knowingest Americans on God's green earth. Their way of living, in their opinion, was the handsomest way of living that human beings had ever hit on. Their institutions were the institutions history had been waiting for. If you had told them that anyone else had a better hold on the earth than they did, or anyone else believed in himself or his country more than they did, they would have laughed in your face. Who an American was and what he was, was not much of a secret. You could see for yourself.

An American was a man who knew which way to take to reach tomorrow. An American was a man who never asked anyone anything—who he was, or where he came from, or what he did—because it was answer enough to be a man, at least in America.

There is no group in this country that is more loyal to the principles of democracy than the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Every-

one recognizes that you are indeed real Americans.

As the distinguished editor and publisher of The Rock County Star Herald, Alan C. McIntosh, so aptly said, "I am an American, but I am a tired American. I'm tired of being called the Ugly American. I am weary of the beatniks who say they should have the right to determine what laws of the land they are willing to obey. I am a tired American—fed up with the mobs of long-haired youths and short-haired girls who claim they represent the 'new wave' of America and who sneer at the old-fashioned virtues of honesty, integrity, and morality on which America grew to greatness. I am tired of supporting families who haven't known any other source of income than the Government relief checks. I am tired . . . of the filth peddlers . . . who try to foist on us the belief that filth is an integral part of culture in the arts, the movies, literature, and the stage. I am a tired American, weary of the bearded bums who tramp the . . . sit-ins, who prefer communism to capitalism, and sneer at the President as a threat to peace. I am a tired American who resents those who try to disseminate the belief, in our institutions of learning, that capitalism is a dirty word and that free enterprise and private initiative are only synonyms for greed. I am a tired American who gets a lump in his throat when he hears the Stars Spangled Banner. I am a tired American who thanks a merciful Lord that he was so lucky to be born an American citizen—a nation under God, with mercy and justice for all."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 5554) to provide a special milk program for children, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$125,000,000" and insert "\$120,000,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT OF 1937 TO AUTHORIZE PRODUCTION RESEARCH UNDER MARKETING AGREEMENT AND ORDER PROGRAMS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14810) to amend section 602(3) and section 608c(6) (I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to authorize production research under marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to authorize production research under marketing agreement and order programs, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 674; 50 Stat. 249)," and insert "Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation (7 U.S.C. 601; 48 Stat. 31),".

Page 1, line 6, strike out "602(3)" and insert "2(3)".

Page 1, line 8, strike out all after "section" over to and including "(6) (I)," in line 1 on page 2 and insert "8c(6) (I),".

Page 2, line 3, strike out "608c(6)" and insert "8c(6)".

Page 2, line 9, strike out "provision" and insert "proviso."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend section 2(3) and section 8c(6) (I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation, so as to authorize production research under marketing agreement and order programs."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

JOSE LUIS CALLEJA-PEREZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1747) for the relief of Jose Luis Calleja-Perez.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DR. ANTHONY S. MASTRIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15760) for the relief of Dr. Anthony S. Mastrian.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MRS. MARGARET M. McNELLIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8573) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. McNellis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 8573

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Margaret M. McNellis, of Waterbury, Connecticut, the sum of \$10,900 certified to him by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as provided in section 3 of this Act in

full settlement of all her claims against the United States arising out of misrepresentations made to her daughter by personnel of the United States Public Health Service concerning Mrs. McNellis' eligibility for medical care in civilian facilities under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, following an accident on September 24, 1966.

SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in the first section of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike "of \$10,000" and insert "certified to him by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as provided in Section 3 of this Act".

Page 2, after line 11, add the following: "SEC. 3. Upon application made within six months of the effective date of the Act, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine the amount representing the charges for services in the period from September 24, 1966 through April 1967 that would otherwise be payable under the Public Health Service program for civilian medical care had the said Mrs. Margaret M. McNellis been an eligible beneficiary under the provisions of chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall certify the amount so determined to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment as provided in section 1 of this Act. The amount paid under the authority of this Act, shall not include any amounts paid or reimbursed through insurance by reason of the same hospitalization."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATKINSON, HASERICK & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10534) for the relief of Atkinson, Haserick & Co., Inc.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN RETIRED OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13676) for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 13676

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of funds not otherwise appropriated, to each individual named in section 2 of this Act the sum opposite his name. The sum stated is to constitute full satisfaction of each named individual's claim for unpaid retired pay accruing subsequent to his return to an inactive status on a re-



Public Law 91-295
91st Congress, H. R. 5554
June 30, 1970

An Act

84 STAT. 336

To provide a special milk program for children.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended to read as follows:

Child Nutrition
Act of 1966,
amendment.
80 Stat. 885.
42 USC 1772.

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for each succeeding fiscal year, not to exceed \$120,000,000, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules and regulations as he may deem in the public interest, to encourage consumption of fluid milk by children in the United States in (1) nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, and (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. For the purposes of this section 'United States' means the fifty States, Guam, and the District of Columbia. The Secretary shall administer the special milk program provided for by this section to the maximum extent practicable in the same manner as he administered the special milk program provided for by Public Law 89-642, as amended, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969." "United States."

[Note by the Office of the Federal Register.—The foregoing Act, having been presented to the President of the United States on Wednesday, June 17, 1970, for his approval and not having been returned by him to the House of Congress in which it originated within the time prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, has become a law without his approval on June 30, 1970.]

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORT No. 91-110 (Comm. on Agriculture).

SENATE REPORT No. 91-842 (Comm. on Agriculture and Forestry).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Vol. 115 (1969): May 6, considered and passed House.

Vol. 116 (1970): May 11, considered and passed Senate, amended.
June 16, House concurred in Senate amendment.

Office of the White House Press Secretary
(San Clemente, California)

THE WHITE HOUSE

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Eleven days ago, the Congress sent to me H. R. 5554, which would extend the authorization for the special milk program. I have not signed this measure. But, today -- without my signature -- it becomes law.

H. R. 5554 authorizes appropriations of \$120 million in Fiscal Year 1971 and subsequent years. The Administration's 1971 budget did not include funds for this program. In a special message to the Congress February 26, 1970, I urged that this and similar lower-priority Federal subsidy programs be discontinued. As I said then, no time-honored program is sacrosanct if it cannot be justified on the grounds of high priority.

The funds authorized in H. R. 5554 subsidize the purchase of milk, in the great majority of cases subsidizing families able to pay the full cost. Less than 10 percent of the milk served goes to children from poverty families.

I am mindful of the vital importance of milk for all of our school-children and also of the genuine need to keep our dairy industry strong. But I firmly believe the major portion of the funds authorized in this bill should have been authorized for more effective nutritional programs to benefit children from poor families and on a basis which includes milk as part of the balanced, nutritious school lunch program.

I have already acted on this conviction. On May 14, 1970, I signed into law H. R. 515 which improved the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act. The effect of this legislation is to assure that every child from a family whose income falls below the poverty line will receive a free or reduced-price lunch. These lunches include milk.

To properly fund this legislation, a budget amendment of \$217 million additional is being transmitted to the Congress today for the school lunch and child nutrition programs in fiscal 1971, bringing the total Federal funding for these programs to \$900 million. That amount is by no means the whole story of this Administration's determined efforts to eliminate hunger and malnutrition in America. Total requests for food assistance programs in fiscal '71 exceed \$2.5 billion, more than twice the amount expended on these programs two years ago and \$900 million more than I requested and obtained last year.

Thus there should be no doubt about this Administration's commitment to the fight against hunger. If this effort is to be successful, it must be carried on in a way that is clearly recognized as responsible. We must avoid wasting the taxpayers' money on overlapping and unnecessary programs. Therefore, it should be clearly understood that whatever funds I use from this program I intend to use for the school lunch and child nutrition and milk programs for children from poverty families, and not for those who are in no need of such a subsidy. I have allowed this measure to become law with these objectives in view.

In its future actions on spending, I urge the Congress to join me in the constant and crucial effort to hold down Federal spending and prevent another wave of inflation.

